

# THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NO. 63-VOL. III,

11.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

## MY LORD SCULLY.

Lord Scully is again before the public. The western newspapers have recently been publishing accounts of him and his doings, and now the New York Herald gives him the benefit of a circulation that includes all the crowned heads of Europe in a long article, preceded in big type by such lines as these: "My Lord Scully. An English Landlord who is Oppressing American Farmers in the West. Feudal Leases Made. Compelling Rack Rents Over 90,000 Acres on the Irish plan."

The Herald's correspondent, who writes from Alton, Illinois, does not seem to be fully informed about Lord Scully, as he makes no reference to his earlier career as a Tipperary landlord, or to the immense tracts of lands which he holds in other states and territories of the newer west. But he describes how this wicked lord, when not more than thirty, came to the United States, and in 1850 bought large tracts of land at low prices in one of the richest sections of Illinois; how he has constantly added to them in that and adjoining states, and refuses to sell an acre; how he has introduced the Irish system of tenancy; how he lives in London on the princely income drawn from the toil of his American tenants, out of whom his rents are ruthlessly squeezed by his resident agent, one Koehule, whose office is at Lincoln, the capital of Logan county; how he only gives leases for three years, which he has recently reduced to one; how the incoming tenant is obliged to buy the fixtures of the outgoing tenant; how such permanent improvements as the tenants make are taken advantage of by raising the rent; how he takes a lien upon his tenants' crops in order to secure his dues; how he has now introduced a clause in his leases by which the tenant is obliged to pay all taxes levied upon the land; and, in short, how he takes full advantage of the laws of Illinois which make him the absolute owner of the land he has bought and permit him to eject therefrom any one who wants to live upon it and will not comply with the owner's conditions.

The Herald's correspondent also tells of the indignation which has been excited in Illinois at this introduction by an alien landlord of what are called "feudal methods," and of several bills which the legislature has passed aimed nominally against alien landlords in general, but in reality against this wicked Lord Scully in particular. One of these bills prohibits alien landlords from including the payment of taxes in the rent of farm lands as a part of the rental. Another so restricts the right of aliens to acquire and hold property in Illinois that Lord Scully will be unable to buy any more land so long as he remains an alien, and further provides for the escheat of his lands to the state if after his death his heirs do not signify their intention of becoming American citizens. There are serious doubts as to the constitutionality of these acts, but it sufficiently shows how tender Illinois legislation is of the rights of landlords, that Lord Scully can avoid all the Illinois acts on the simple condition of becoming an American citizen. All he has to do, when he comes here on his accustomed trip next summer, is to take out first papers of naturalization, and then, so far as the laws of Illinois are concerned, he can rack rent his tenants in peace while he lives, and when he dies turn them over to the tender mercies of his heir, far more securely than if his lands were located in his native Tipperary.

Do the legislators of Illinois deem this Lord Scully so desirable an acquisition to the body of their citizenship that they would thus coerce him into forswearing his allegiance to Queen Victoria? And what would his tenants gain if Lord Scully, coerced by these Illinois laws, were to become an American citizen? Is it any easier to pay rack rent to an American citizen than it is to a British subject? To make him an American citizen would not be to make him a resident of America. Are there not thousands of American citizens who already live in Europe on rents drawn from this country? And would not Lord Scully or Lord Scully's heir, were he to become an American citizen, be just as free to spend his income in Europe, Asia, Africa or Australia as he is now? But supposing he did come to America to live. Would his Illinois tenants be any better off if Lord Scully lived in New York or Boston or Chicago or Washington than if he lived in Europe?

But why all this outcry against Lord Scully, and this effort to compel him to become an American citizen? What has he done that he should be railed at by papers and politicians that uphold the system of which he is the outgrowth? If he evicts tenants who do not pay their rent, does he do any more than is done every day by American landlords in all parts of the country? If he appeals to the law to seize for him the property of those who do not pay him the stipulated price for the use of his land, do not other landlords habitually do the same? If by reason of increased population and great public improvements he is now able to rent his land for much more per annum than he originally paid for it outright, is not this the very privilege for which he paid

## THE MILLS BILL.

### HOW MUCH AND HOW LITTLE IT WOULD REDUCE TARIFF ROBBERY.

The primitive method of levying import duties is to take them in kind. The pirates and robbers who set up the first custom houses, or, as the Chinese still call them, "squeeze stations," took by way of duty such or such a part of the goods themselves, permitting on this condition the trader or traveler to retain or carry on the rest. As the progress of civilization caused the greater use of money, the primitive method of collecting duties in kind was changed to the method of collecting them in money. Under the latter method, which is still in use in modern custom houses or "squeeze stations," the duty is not taken in yards of cloth, pounds of iron, pairs of stockings or bags of sugar, but an equivalent sum of money is demanded. The effect, however, upon the citizen or subject who is thus "protected" in order to "encourage his industry," is precisely the same as if the primitive method of collecting duties were still followed. For the same expenditure of money or labor he gets just so much less of foreign productions, as if the custom house officers took so many oranges out of every dozen, and so much sugar out of every pound, or cut so much off of every bar of iron or every yard of cloth. The following table is designed to show to the eye what, in the case of the principal articles of import affected by the Mills bill, this proportion is under present duties and what it would be under the proposed duties.

Let the first line under each title represent a certain quantity of the specified goods which the foreign producer is willing to exchange with an American for a bushel of wheat, a barrel of petroleum, a Keystone watch, a pound of cotton, or a dollar in money. The second line will then show how much of this quantity the "protected" American gets after the present duty and a profit of twenty per cent upon the duty has been taken out of it. In the section of the table which deals with the articles on which the Mills bill proposes only a reduction of duty, the third line will show how much more would be left to the "protected" American under the reduced robbery that the Mills bill still proposes to permit.

It must be remembered, however, that in this table no account is taken of cost of transportation and profits upon original costs. These, of course, would take a further slice from what the American consumer would finally get. The object of this table is only to show how far the Mills bill would reduce that robbery, to which, under the name of "protection," we are all subjected, in order to swell the profits of trusts and monopolists, who are the only ultimate beneficiaries of "protection."

### DUTIES ABOLISHED BY THE MILLS BILL.

As to the following items, which are put upon the free list, the Mills bill would permit us to get all that the foreigner gives:

TOBACCO, Brick, Flaxseed, Wheel Hubs, Jute, Soap (common), Cement, Garden Seeds, Plaster of Paris, Nickel Ore, Granite and all Building Stone, Potash, Coal Tar, Naphtha, Benzine and Coal Tar Products, except Dyes. Present duty 20 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

PAINTINGS, Gelatine. Present duty 30 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

SULPHUR, Tin Plates, Figs. Present duty 55 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

WOOL, unmanufactured. Present duty about 36 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

SALT IN BAGS. Present duty 30 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

CROTON and Cotton Seed Oil. Present duty 62½ per cent. And Chicory Root. Present duty 65 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

BIBLES, Needles (except Machine Needles), Isinglass, Books in Foreign Languages and for Free Distribution, Essential Oils, Currants, Chlorate of Potash, Crude Glycerine, Osier and Willow for Baskets, Feathers (undressed), Dates. Present duty 25 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

CHINA CLAY, Opium, Iron or Steel Baling Hoops. Present duty 45 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

COPPER ORE. Present duty 40½ per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

MARBLE, Bagging for Cotton, Copperas. Present duty 55 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

SALT IN BULK. Present duty 70½ per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

BLUE VITRIOL. Present duty 77 per cent. Proposed duty free.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

### DUTIES REDUCED BY THE MILLS BILL.

COMMON EARTHENWARE. Present duty 55 per cent. Proposed duty 35 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

FINE DECORATED CHINA, Plaques, Bisque, etc. Present duty 60 per cent. Proposed duty 45 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

CASTOR OIL. Present duty 195 per cent. Proposed duty 98 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

PATENT MEDICINES. Present duty 50 per cent. Proposed duty 30 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

TOBACCO (Wrappers). Present duty 82 per cent. Proposed duty 38 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

RICE, Cleaned. Present duty 113 per cent. Proposed duty 96 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

CLOAKS, Dolmans. Present duty 68 per cent. Proposed duty 45 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

CARPETS, Rugs, etc. Present duty 48 per cent. Proposed duty 39 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

IRON OR STEEL T RAILS. Present duty 74 per cent. Proposed duty 52 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

STEEL RAILWAY BARS. Present duty 84 per cent. Proposed duty 55 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

recognized that the holding of valuable land was a trust in which special responsibilities of some sort were annexed to special privileges, but of that Roman system of land tenure which De Laveleye terms quiritary, and which confounds the essential distinction between property in that element which nature has provided as the dwelling place and storehouse of man and property in the things that man's labor draws from it. It is simply because Lord Scully is not a citizen, and because he prefers to invest his money in land titles rather than in mortgages, and to receive his return rather in what is clearly rent than in what is nominally interest, that he is made the target of so much abuse, and that the legislature of a sovereign state devotes itself to the passing of bills designed to compel him to become a citizen.

Lord Scully may, however, be certain that there is one class of Americans who will not abuse him. These are the men who really understand and appreciate what Thomas Jefferson meant when he placed in the American Declaration of Independence that immortal proclamation of God-given and unalienable rights. It is not merely that our recognition of the natural equality of men with respect to the natural opportunities to life and labor has rid us of those low and mean prejudices against men on account of accidents of birth, but that we rather like Lord Scully because he enables our own countrymen, quicker than one of their own number could, to see that we have not destroyed the essence of aristocracy by prohibiting the granting of titles of nobility. In Scotland, we might well wish that Mr. Ross Winans, nominally of Baltimore, or our well "protected" Pennsylvania workingman, Mr. Triumphant Democracy Carnegie, might buy up every inch from Solway to Pentland Firth, and converting the whole thing into a deer park and playground, show the great mass of Scotsmen how much "their own, their native land," is in reality theirs. So in this country, might we well wish that Lord Scully, be-

### WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S DRESS GOODS.

Present duty 73 per cent. Proposed duty 40 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

IRON OR STEEL RAILWAY FISH PLATES. Present duty 93 per cent. Proposed duty 59½ per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

IRON OR STEEL BEAMS, Girders, Etc. Present duty 103 per cent. Proposed duty 49½ per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

LOOKING GLASS, not above 24 by 60 inches. Present duty 78 per cent. Proposed duty 55 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

COMMON WINDOW GLASS, in sheets above 24 by 80 inches. Present duty 108 per cent. Proposed duty 66 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

PLATE GLASS, above 24 by 60 inches. Present duty 153 per cent. Proposed duty 123 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

SUGAR, Ordinary Grades. Present duty, which varies with polariscopic test, about 84 per cent. Proposed duty about 68 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

SHAWLS and Worsteds Cloths. Present duty 65 per cent. Proposed duty 40 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

FLANNELS, Blankets, Yarns, etc. Present duty 68 per cent. Proposed duty 40 per cent.

What the foreigner gives us—

What the present duty permits us to get—

What the Mills bill would permit us to get—

noblemen of the Illinois peerage may be, "My Lord" Scully is no fool.

One result of the failure of the recent strikes in the Lehigh and Schuylkill coal fields has been to somewhat open the eyes of Mr. Powderly. In January, in the first of a series of letters addressed to the order of which he is general master workman, through the *Journal of United Labor*, Mr. Powderly said:

I no longer believe that the people "in common" can till the soil and own it in common. First, because they do not think "in common"; second, because the people are not people and not angels.

In the current number of the *Journal of United Labor* Mr. Powderly has an article entitled "Who owns the coal fields?" in which he says:

I advance the proposition that the coal fields of Pennsylvania belong to the people of the United States, and should be operated by the United States government for the welfare of the whole people. The coal should be dug and sent to market at a fair price; it should be placed at the door of every man who desired it; it should be within the reach of all, and there could be tons dug where pounds are brought forth now.

Surely the result of the recent strikes has not been to convince Mr. Powderly either that the people have learned to think "in common," or that the people are after all not only people but also angels. Yet here he is proposing that the people of the United States should not only own the coal lands of Pennsylvania "in common," and work them "in common," but that they should "in common" carry this coal to the door of every man who wants it.

If Mr. Powderly will open his eyes fully and look clearly, he will see that to break up the monopoly of the coal fields, to assure to the coal miners full employment and fair wages without bitter and wasteful strikes, and to enable the whole people to fairly participate in the benefits of the provision which nature in the coal deposits has made for man's needs, it is not necessary that the United States government should take possession of the Pennsylvania coal lands, still less that it should go into the business of mining, shipping and peddling coal.

All that it is necessary to do is, abolishing all the taxes that now hamper and restrain the exertion of labor and the investment of capital, to take for the common use and benefit those values that attach to land, irrespective of the improvements made upon it. Then land would be valuable only to the user, and it would pay no one to hold idle natural opportunities needed for the use of the community. Unworked coal veins and miners wasting their time in enforced idleness could not then exist together, and in the return that the community would get for the privilege of using natural opportunities more valuable than those freely open to labor, all would become equal sharers in the bounty of their Creator, and would equally enjoy all the advantages that social growth and improvement bring.

The only businesses which it is necessary for the people in common, as represented by the government, to take in hand, are businesses like the telegraph and the railway, which are monopolies in their nature, and not by virtue of restrictive laws.

If Mr. Powderly will re-read his own official address to the order of the Knights of Labor in 1883, an address which since the re-publication of its pertinent parts in *THE STANDARD* has been extensively republished, he will find the clue to a golden mean between the denial of common rights to land and the state socialism into which he now jumps. The root of all the oppression of labor is the denial of the natural and equal rights of man, the granting to some of privileges denied to others.

The land and labor committee have called a conference, with power to resolve itself into a convention, to meet at the same place and date as had already been fixed for the union labor convention, the programme evidently being to combine with that party, and put a presidential candidate in the field before the conventions of the old parties are held.

The committee ask for the sending of three delegates from each congressional district, three from each of the territories, and three from the District of Columbia. As it is only in comparatively few of the congressional districts that there is anything like organization of single tax men, and as those among us who can afford to pay their own expenses to a national conference are exceedingly few, this arrangement will make it very easy for any interest concerned in getting a third party candidate into the field, to pack the conference with delegates in favor of nominating a candidate.

Regarding this call as a step in the programme of putting up a presidential candidate without reference to the issue which now seems certain to be made between the two great national parties in this campaign, I for one shall take no part in response to it. That this will be the position of the great majority of single tax men throughout the country the expressions of opinion which have been already published in *THE STANDARD* leave no doubt. The men who do not propose to ignore the tariff issue, and who do not propose to be used as protectionist cats-paws in the great struggle now impending, are hardly likely to attend a confer-



ence composed of them cannot know whom in order to make a purely negative fight. It is expedient for single tax men to counsel together with reference to national action, the proper time will obviously be after the two great national parties have made their platforms and nominated their candidates, and the issue in the presidential struggle is definitely made. For such consultation the conference which Messrs. Williams and Bailey have proposed to call for July 4 will afford much the best opportunity.

We print to-day another set of diagrams illustrative of the proposed reductions of the Mills bill. Our complicated system of imposing fines and penalties on the bringing into the country of things the people of the country want, offers endless opportunities of arithmetical amusement and instruction, and school teachers especially would find in it a magazine from which interesting questions adapted to all grades might be drawn. Nor would it lessen the value of Sunday school instruction if in addition to such questions as, "Where did Solomon get cedar for the temple?" scholars were also asked how much Solomon, if he were a protected American citizen, would have had to pay for the privilege of bringing such wood into the United States? or were told to make an estimate of how much it would have cost the queen of Sheba to get her gifts through an American custom house?

It will be a matter of disappointment to many who have looked forward to her arrival that Miss Taylor is not coming to the United States next month as was anticipated. But it is to be hoped that she will ere long find opportunity to carry out her long delayed intention of visiting this country. She may be sure of a warm welcome when she does so.

Except to its European subscribers THE STANDARD of this week will be more or less delayed—as pretty much everything in or about New York has been this week delayed—by the blizzard.

HENRY GEORGE.

#### THE TARIFF PROTECTED SUGAR TRUST.

The witnesses before the congressional committee that is now investigating trusts display the same facility in dodging disagreeable questions that marked the proceedings before the committee of the New York state senate. The congressional committee is less tender in its treatment of these magnates of monopoly, however, and rudely insists on seeing papers and on receiving definite answers to questions. Mr. Havemeyer and other interested witnesses continue to insist that the sugar trust is, on the whole, a benevolent combination which, so far from desiring to enhance the cost of sugar to consumers, really aims to lower prices by cheapening methods. Such testimony, like a great deal of that frequently given before investigating committees, raises a curious question as to the exact meaning attached by many eminently respectable gentlemen to the obligation of an oath.

Disinterested witnesses do not take quite so rosy a view of the probable results of establishing a monopoly of sugar. Mr. Thurber, a wholesale grocer of this city, said that though large concerns could produce more cheaply than small ones, they do not usually choose to sell more cheaply unless compelled to do so by competition. The present combination might, he thought, control the New York market to some extent, but if prices were raised beyond a certain point other refineries would be started and other markets would compete for our supply. He admitted, however, that trusts easily break down or capture those who interfere with their monopoly. Hugh N. Camp, who was for sixteen years a sugar refiner, said he had heard of a vessel that found difficulty in selling a cargo of sugar in New York in January of the present year because there was no longer any buyer here other than the trust, and it would not pay the price asked. This brings clearly to view the capacity of these monopolies for putting down the prices of raw product while putting up the price to the consumer.

One of Mr. Camp's answers shows how vital an interest the working people, as such, have in the effort to curtail the power of these monopolies. He said he did not believe that a workman who had trouble with one refinery belonging to the trust could get employment in any other refinery belonging to the combination. This certainly appears probable, and it shows that, if the monopoly is maintained intact, the workers in refineries will soon be entirely at the mercy of their employers. That this is one of the objects of trusts and other combinations of manufacturers has long been apparent, but it has rarely been so frankly announced as it is in the articles of agreement made by a number of Philadelphia manufacturers and already commented upon in THE STANDARD. These gentlemen frankly declare that their chief object is united action for the maintenance of a high tariff and for resisting the demands of labor for higher wages.

It seems useless to follow the congressional investigation closely. We already understand fully the object and method of trusts. They seek to put under the control of one compact body of men the whole management of the particular industry to which they relate. That they will thus be enabled to reduce the cost of production is doubtless true. Their object, however, is to increase the profits of the manufacturers forming the combination. They are probably wise enough not to kill the goose that lays for them golden eggs. They will not force down the price paid

for raw sugar so low as to drive it to other markets or curtail its production, and they will not raise the price of the refined product high enough to make a market here for sugar refined in other countries. Within these limitations the trust can tax the people for one of the necessities of life just as much as it chooses, and it is doubtful if any law can be framed that will prevent the formation of secret combinations of this character should open trusts be broken up.

The remedy is not so much to be looked for in new laws as in the repeal of old ones. The sugar trust is the direct outgrowth of our high tariff. Had there been no duties on sugar it would never have been formed. If the duty on manufactured sugar were now lowered the power of the trust to make unjust exactions would be to just that extent lowered, and if this were carried far enough there would no longer be any object in maintaining the combination. If the reduction of duty on the manufactured product in the bill proposed by the committee of ways and means is not sufficient to assure the destruction of this trust a further reduction ought to be made. The first step toward effective legislation against trusts must be tariff reduction.

#### THE PAUPER ZINC OF SILESIA.

The Chicago Tribune recently declared that the tariff on zinc has built up a monopoly that has enabled a few men in the two Illinois towns of La Salle and Peru to amass millions by the employment of imported labor. A reporter of the *Inter Ocean* rushes to the defense of the tariff and denounces the *Tribune* as the "organ of free trade and the Cobden club." The two concerns criticised by that paper are the Matthiessen & Hegeler zinc company and the Illinois zinc company, of which latter Calvin Wells of Pittsburg, the millionaire proprietor of the Philadelphia Press, is president. The *Inter Ocean* correspondent interviewed representatives of both companies and managed to bring out facts that support the *Tribune's* charges, and others that show clearly the folly of our "protective" system.

No attempt was made to show that the proprietors had not amassed millions, but, on the contrary, the reporter dwelt with evident satisfaction upon the fact. As to the charge that laborers had been "imported," a vigorous denial was made, but it was at the same time admitted that of the 425 men employed by the Illinois company but one-fifth were Americans, the remainder being Poles and Germans, who, though not "imported," came here from Europe for the specific purpose of working in this establishment. Of the 528 hands employed in the larger establishment, 356 were Poles and Germans, 121 were boys born of foreign parents, and 51 were men of American birth. The large proportion of foreigners appears to have impressed the reporter, and he asked Mr. Means, the manager of the Illinois company, the cause. That gentleman replied: "Ours is a kind of work you cannot get Americans to do when they can take to farming or something else, and therefore many of our hands have been in the works in Silesia." Mr. Means went on to explain that the foreign hands can live cheaply, "for all work, even the little tots." He further said that many men who had once been engaged in the works are now successful farmers.

After this very frank showing of the facts, Mr. Means dropped quite naturally into the usual protection cant about the influence of the tariff in advancing the price of labor, notwithstanding his own admissions that the wages paid by his company are so low that American workmen, accustomed to the standard of living maintained in this country and disposed to send their children to school, will not work for them, because they can do better at farming. The men who do work for the zinc companies come here from the mines of Silesia and accept wages that require them to live meanly, and to put even their "little tots" to work, and thus rear them in an ignorance that causes some of them, though born here, to accept the conditions refused by the majority of Americans around them. He also shows that the more intelligent and enterprising of the immigrant workmen escape from employment in this protected industry to the more lucrative unprotected farming industry. In the face of facts like these, Mr. Means's pretense that the tariff on zinc is maintained for the purpose of protecting American labor against "the pauper labor of Europe" is not likely to deceive any sensible man.

That the tariff has had a great deal to do with building up the zinc industry in this country is probably true, but the facts as stated by the persons interviewed cannot fail to raise a question as to whether that building up is worth to the American people what it has cost them. Mr. Matthiessen, the head of the larger company, told the reporter that a sudden removal of the duty on zinc would disturb the entire zinc industry in this country. He said:

"We can't mine so cheaply nor so abundantly as it is done in Europe, where deposits are worked with which our deposits now worked here could not compete. A great many things have been started in this country which could not have been without the duty, and mines have been worked which would not have been without the stimulus of protection. The miners would feel it were the duty removed, for I doubt if all the zinc works could offer high enough prices to keep all the mines going. . . . Yes, there are great deposits in Silesia, and they are increasing the working of them daily. You see, their smelting works are near the coast, and so it is easy to bring both ore and fuel. In many cases they work to better advantage than we. If rich mines were discovered here we might export spelter, but at the present price of ore we could not think of it."

Mr. Means, referring to the same mat-

ter, said that the European output of spelter (bar zinc) in 1886 was 254,500 tons, and the American output during the same year was 42,641 tons, and our imports less than 2,000 tons. We produce about one-sixth of the whole world's product, and it comes within less than 2,000 tons of supplying our home demand. In order that this demand shall be thus supplied a tax of \$1.50 per hundred pounds has been imposed on spelter, which sells for \$4.43 per hundred weight in London, and a tax of \$2.50 per hundred pounds is imposed on sheet zinc. As the zinc produced here is also worked here this latter is the tax paid by the public to the government on imported zinc and to the manufacturers on the domestic article, so that from Mr. Means's own statement we pay at least \$2,000,000 a year more for zinc than we otherwise would have to pay.

What do we get in return? Simply this: A few land owners in Wisconsin and other states obtain handsome incomes for allowing workmen to dig zinc ore, a few manufacturers become millionaires and a number of Germans and Poles, who would otherwise be making spelter for us in Silesia, are brought over to make spelter for us in the United States. Is that worth \$2,000,000 a year to the American people?

Mr. Matthiessen refused to say to the reporter that a change in the tariff would ruin the zinc industry in this country, but intimated that only the richer mines could be kept open. So far as the zinc working industry is concerned, he declared that he had never petitioned for protection, and his partner, Mr. Hegeler, said: "Let congress do what it pleases, we'll get along all right." Both of them said, however, that the effect of a reduction would be the lowering of miners' wages. This is not necessarily true. Their wages cannot fall much below that paid for farm labor even now, and under any general reduction of the tariff the tendency would be to increase the profits of agriculture and to advance the wages of those engaged in it. Instead of wages falling, the royalties of those who now hold on to mining lands and exact tribute for allowing men to work would be reduced.

With free trade, if a man understanding the business found that he could do as well for himself by mining zinc as at any other occupation, he would mine zinc. If, on the other hand, he discovered that the "pauper labor of Europe" was willing to mine zinc so cheaply that it would be better for Americans to buy it than to make it, the American labor would earn better wages at producing something that could be profitably exchanged for the Silesian pauper zinc, and would not waste his efforts in an unprofitable industry. There would under such circumstances be no difficulty in finding for these miners a more profitable occupation. A larger number than all those engaged in the zinc industry arrive in New York each week of spring and summer, and find something to do, and, furthermore, if the government had never begun taxing the American people to promote the interest of the owners of zinc ore lands, these men, who have been brought here to work in zinc mines, would have been in Silesia, and not in the United States.

#### FINDLAY'S NATURAL GAS.

A few years ago, on the discovery that great quantities of natural gas lay not far under the surface of the earth in the region of Findlay, Ohio, the people of that town hastened to utilize the gift that nature thus made them, lighting the streets with the gas and burning it as fuel in their manufacturing; and in a short time through its use coal and wood were driven almost entirely out of the local market. The fame of Findlay's cheap light and heat being noised about the country, large numbers of people were attracted to the place, some of them establishing new manufacturing there, many seeking employment of its business men, others taking up with the occupation of sinking wells and selling gas, and others, again, buying land and holding it for a profit because of the chances that gas might be reached by wells bored down through it.

Many men were enriched through the discovery and utilization of the Findlay gas basins. The manufacturers who were on the spot early after the discovery of the gas, and who bought for themselves land that at once served as sites for their works and as means of access to a supply of gas, are to-day enjoying a great advantage over manufacturers elsewhere who use coal, and over late comers to Findlay who must pay high prices for land. The owners of wells, for a considerable period, made large profits, raising the price of gas from time to time, as the demand for it became greater from the growing population of Findlay and as the supply of it was artificially restricted through the holding out of use for speculative purposes of a large area of land covering the subterranean reservoirs of gas. Land owners, however, made money more surely and easily than any other class, gaining not only by the rise in price of all the land known to command access to the gas, and even of that which was only supposed to do so, but also of all the town lots of Findlay and the farming lands around about the town.

While fortunes were thus being made, however, a discussion arose among the people of Findlay as to whether it was best for all or just toward all that comparatively a few men should reap profits in delivering the gas, no outlay of labor or money being required in its production. While no one questioned that the owner of a piece of land had a right to all the gas that he could cause to flow through it, no attempt, it seems, was made by any one to prove that the stores of gas in the bowels of the earth were or ought to be

reduced to private ownership. Nobody advanced the notion that they belonged to any man by right of discovery, or that title to them ought to vest in any one because of earliest appropriation, or that exclusive possession of them could be acquired through the expenditures involved in sinking the first well by which a flow of gas was secured. Nor did the owners of the surface of the earth lying above the gas basins claim that their rights in the gas required a division of its supply among them proportioned to the area of the land owned by each. The people of Findlay assumed that the combustible gas, like the water of the ocean, belonged to all. That postulate standing unchallenged, and consideration having been given to proposed methods of public supply, the municipality of Findlay bought and bored wells and laid pipes in the streets of the town, and now all its inhabitants may obtain natural gas for cooking and illuminating purposes at a cost slightly above that of its production at the point where it is burned. This result is deemed admirable by the people of Findlay in general, but, as may be imagined, it is not satisfactory to the men engaged in supplying natural gas to consumers, their profits having been diminished since the city trench upon their business. Neither is speculating in such land as may perchance prove an entrance way to the gas deposits any longer so highly profitable an enterprise as it was. The public, however, is but little concerned about the disappointment of the rings of speculators who are making of a general necessity a means of gain for themselves. Popular sentiment declares that a fair division is being made among the people of something that was unquestionably the property of all.

Had the present generation of Findlayites stood by and permitted a complete appropriation of the sources of the natural gas supply in that locality by private individuals, is it not probable that the next generation of natural gas owners would stubbornly contest the right of the municipality of Findlay to go into the business of supplying its citizens with any of the gas from beneath the surface of the earth? Would they not interpose with forces that the public of Findlay would find it difficult to overcome—tedious litigation, inexhaustible streams of editorial writing, procured protests against an invasion of private rights falsely quoted as the voice of public opinion? Would not learned lawyers eloquently plead the cause of the gas owners? Would not the newspapers bring the charge of rank communism against the advocates of the natural rights of the people? Would not the gas owners be able to exhibit charters from the legislature and titles from the state tending to prove that not only the surface of the earth in the natural gas region, but the underground basins as well, were absolutely and exclusively their property and that of their heirs and assigns forever? And would they not cause many conservative and conscientious people to doubt the "theory" that the gas was a gift from nature to mankind in general?

But no danger of all that now. The people of Findlay, it is their belief, have in a public spirited manner done away with the monopoly of natural gas. They reflect upon the possibilities of being squeezed in purse by the gas grabbers to which they were exposed until they took the matter in their own hands and dealt with it as they considered just, and they congratulate themselves alike upon the successful operation of their comprehensive scheme of profit sharing and upon their clear perception of the principles of justice in regard to the use of the gas. People in Findlay are generally in good humor over their solution of the problem, and it is at present popularly supposed that the whole matter is completely, and, on the whole, satisfactorily settled.

Yet, correct as have been the principles animating the people of Findlay in dealing with the natural gas question, what have they really accomplished? Have they really abolished monopoly and secured the advantages that will arise from the supply of gas that nature has afforded to all the people of Findlay? Not at all. As the future must show, they have but abolished one monopoly in order that the profits accruing from it shall ultimately pass to another monopoly.

Findlay now offers to the manufacturer cheap heat and power; to the household cheap fuel and light. Findlay, therefore, has on this account become a more desirable place to work in and to live in, and as it is quite as true in Findlay as it is everywhere else that no one can work or live without land, the value of land is going up.

Already land speculation is the most active business in Findlay. Because the monopoly of the gas in the bowels of the earth has been broken the price of the surface of the earth is going up with leaps and bounds. Business sites, house sites, vegetable gardens, farm land and around Findlay, are being marked up, and people are growing rich, without doing any work or in any way adding one iota to the stock of wealth, in anticipation of the increased price that other people will be willing to pay for the privilege of working and living in Findlay and availing themselves of cheap gas.

This increased price, even if it has not done so already, must finally neutralize, or all but neutralize, the advantages which have accrued to the general population of Findlay by the breaking down of the natural gas monopoly; and the net result will simply be that what has been gained in that way will go to the holders of land.

So, then, the question of monopoly is far from being settled in Findlay. Abolishing the monopoly of natural gas has only had a result like that following the

transfer of the water supply of a city from a company overcharging consumers to the municipality itself supplying water at cost, or the building of rapid transit roads to carry people to the suburbs, or the invention of machinery that cheapens production. Capital and labor, in each of these cases, benefit only temporarily, ultimately obtaining no better terms after such improvements are made than they possessed before, land values affected by the improvements rising until the benefits are lost to all classes save the land holders. Just as the people of Findlay cannot rest, as from a task finished, with the abolition of the monopoly of natural gas, so wherever any monopoly short of that in land itself is abolished, men will finally find that they have merely taken away the power of that monopoly from those who possessed it and given it to land holders. In case the great trunk railroad of Dakota were obliged to reduce its rates to cost, the poor farmer of that territory, who is now made to feel the power of the railroad to rob him in freight charges until he is left only with a bare living, might, if he was the owner of the land he cultivated, find his acres so enhanced in value as to make him at least a moderately rich man. But ultimately the poorer farmer, who must rent land or has still to buy it, would find the price of land commensurately increased. If the grossly over capitalized gas companies of New York were to be replaced by the municipality and gas made as cheap as it is in Berlin, the competition of newcomers to New York anxious to share in the improved state of things in the city would finally put rents up until no benefit remained to any but its land holders.

It is well that the smaller monopolies should be attacked and abolished, if for no other reason than that with them out of the way people can more clearly see what the great monopolist really is. But until the monopoly of land is destroyed labor can never secure its own.

#### PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXATION.

The *Review and Record*, a real estate paper which is to Brooklyn what the *Record and Guide* is to New York, has taken up the subject of the abolition of taxation on personal property. Naturally enough a paper representing the kind of constituency which the *Review and Record* does would not lean very favorably toward a tax reform that would throw all taxation upon real estate. This would never be suspected from its own line of argument, however, for it declares that "all property from which an income is drawn . . . sheds taxes as naturally as a turtle's back sheds water, distributing the burden always among those by whom it is used." This being so, there is no reason why the organ of a real estate constituency should oppose taxation on real estate, for the real estate must shed the tax "as naturally as a turtle's back sheds water." And if all species of property equally shed taxation it is obvious that the taxation of but one species will necessarily be the most economical way of raising all the taxes that are needed with the least trouble and expense.

But this canon of taxation is not the only one the *Review and Record* lays before its readers. As a question of principle, it says, there can be no hesitation in deciding on what description of property taxes should be levied, and promptly decides that they should be levied alike on real and personal property. It is quite true that on principle there can be no hesitation in deciding, but this decision that personal and real property should be taxed alike is as unsound as it is prompt. That houses and other improvements of land, which with land are accounted real estate, should in principle stand on the same footing as to taxation with personal property is true; but not so with the land itself. Personal property and improvements are the result of human exertion; they are in the highest sense *property*; to deprive any one of them without his consent and without consideration is stealing, and it is no less stealing, in principle, to take a percentage than to take the whole. But when a man is taxed on the value of his land, he pays for an advantage over his fellow citizens which the particular land gives to him, and receives from the community a full equivalent in that advantage.

The *Review and Record* does not confine itself, however, to discussing questions of principle. In fact, it spares but a brief paragraph to that discussion. Questions of principle do not seem to be in its line, and it turns abruptly to questions of policy. First among the questions of policy comes the suggestion that taxation on personal property drives it from the state. This falls to the ground, according to our real estate contemporary, because "all the states tax, or try to tax, such property." That all the states are, therefore, equally impolitic, and that this gives an opportunity for one of them—ours, for example—to tempt the personal property of other states to seek a home among us by abolishing personal property taxes, is a phase of the subject which does not appear to have exhibited itself to the Brooklyn real estate editor. But if it had, it would no doubt have been relegated to the background by the talented pen that was able to put into shape such a piece of philosophy as this: Personal property "could only be driven out of one state to go into another state where an equally strenuous effort is made to compel it to pass under the yoke, and where the efficient system of assessment that had caused it to migrate would certainly be imitated as soon as its efficiency was discovered." Why a state to which personal property had been forced to migrate should want to imitate the "efficient system" that sent it there, so as to send it further, is past finding out on any

other theory than that personal property is something to be feared, like small pox or typhoid fever. The theory is not wholly new, for it has been the custom of the federal government for a long time to put foreign personal property in quarantine when it immigrates; but it is just as stupid as it would be if it were new.

The other question of policy which our contemporary discusses is the familiar one that "it is useless to attempt to tax personal property, because it cannot be traced, or if traced until it is discovered, it will often be found beyond the jurisdiction of the tax collector." This is supposed to have no weight "because if we cannot find all the personal property that exists we can still find a considerable amount, and what we discover and tax is clear gain." But to whom is the gain if it "sheds taxes as naturally as a turtle's back sheds water?" Of course all thought of the crime engendered by tax laws that invite the public to escape them as far as they can, of the inequalities resulting from the exemption of personal property owners through their trickery or perjury at the expense of personal property owners who will not resort to either trickery or perjury, and of the fact that taxes on personal property are ultimately paid by the consumer which imposes the burden of such taxes on those least able to pay them, is cast aside. The sanctity of property in land looms up like a mountain before the *Review and Record* to hide from its view the inequalities, iniquity and corruption that are involved in the taxation of personal property, and it is not strange that it should lead up to so impotent a conclusion as that indirect taxation, "which has a great deal to recommend it," may finally "knock out all other theories."

Indirect taxation is from every point of view the worst that could be possibly devised. When the final consumer pays the tax he also pays a varied collection of intermediate profits on the tax. Thus, while the government receives a small income at one end of this process of taxation the consumer is subjected to a large outgo at the other. This tax also invites all sorts of schemes to defraud the revenue, with a tendency to undermine public morals and diminish respect for law. It takes property from people by subterfuge, making them feel that they do not contribute to public expenses and that the government is a powerful something of which they are no part and in which they have no other interest than by hook or crook to secure its bounty or escape its vengeance.

The fact is, the *Review and Record* of Brooklyn to the contrary notwithstanding, that as a question of policy as well as of principle, personal property ought not to be taxed. It is equally true that houses and all other improvements included in the term real estate ought not to be taxed. It is true also that land values ought to be taxed to the uttermost. The abolition of taxes on personal property will encourage its production and increase demand for its consumption, while attracting it from places where it is taxed to places where it is not. Likewise will the abolition of taxes on improvements encourage improvement. Taxes on these things make them abnormally expensive, diminish demand for them, and limit their production. None of these results, but the reverse, flow from taxes on land values. Land cannot be increased in quantity; therefore reduction of taxes on it will not give us more land. It cannot be diminished in quantity; therefore increase of taxes on it will not give us less. But high land values tend to keep land out of use, while low values encourage its use; therefore, high values do in effect make less land while low values in effect make more. Now, as taxes on land values make it harder to keep land out of use, such taxes increase the market supply of land and bring values down. For of land almost alone is the statement of the *Review and Record* erroneous, that all property from which an income is drawn "sheds taxes as naturally as a turtle's back sheds water." A tax on any product of labor is a tax on the consumer, while a tax on land values is a tax on the owner of an advantageous opportunity—on the owner, in other words, of a monopoly.

To abolish taxes on personal property is to increase the burden of the users of land improvements, but it is also to increase the burdens of owners of valuable land. And when accomplished it is not improbable that the users of land improvements will soon be willing to abolish taxes on improvements as well as on personal property, and leave the monopolists to pay for the privileges they enjoy, as they should.

The idea of abolishing taxes on personal property is good as far as it goes, and any movement based upon it is in the right direction.

#### NO PRIVATE ASSISTANCE IN LEGISLATION.

The indignant clamor of the protectionists against the refusal of the majority of the ways and means committee to grant private parties hearings on provisions affecting them is largely manufactured, but there are many evidences that some sensible men think that a wrong has really been done to the interests thus refused a hearing. The existence of such a feeling shows how completely the protective policy has caused us to lose sight of the real functions of congress and the character and objects of the taxing power. If it were not for this confusion of thought the demand that the representatives of each industry affected by the Mills bill should be permitted to make verbal argument and protest against the changes proposed would excite nothing but laughter and ridicule.

This bill does not propose to increase



taxes on any commodity or business. On the contrary, it proposes to reduce taxes. If it were a proposal to increase taxes, clamor against it by the persons affected might be reasonable, but a protest by taxpayers against a reduction of taxation is so abnormal and absurd at the first glance that its mere existence is a cause for looking closely into a system that brings about so strange a result. Such an examination discloses at once the fact that the concern of those people is not the loss of revenue by the government, but the cutting off of their incidental power as private individuals to levy taxes on the public for their own benefit.

This is a power that never ought to have been given to them. Of all the sovereign powers of government there is none more far reaching or more capable of abuse than the power of taxation. It is practically without limit or restraint except that imposed by the people at the ballot box or through armed revolution. It should never be exercised for other than public purposes; and to farm it out or share it with individuals is a distinct mark of barbarism. Yet here in America private individuals have become so accustomed to looking to this great power as a mere part of their stock in trade as business men, that they actually grow indignant at any evidence that the legislative department of the government proposes to exercise it with a view to public benefit, solely, and to refuse to consult private individuals as partners in its possession.

There are few things that have happened since the present tariff agitation began that are so wholesome in effect as this refusal to permit the representatives of special interests to participate with the people's representatives in the making of a new tariff law. The majority of the ways and means committee have shown that they understand something of the proper duties and responsibilities of representatives sent to congress by the people to legislate for the common welfare.

#### THE TELEPHONE INVESTIGATION.

The report of the assembly committee that has been investigating the conduct of the telephone business in this state may be summed up in a single paragraph. The business is in the hands of an odious monopoly, which first charges local companies extortionate royalties for permitting them to operate telephone lines in this state, and then insists that they shall donate to it thirty-five per cent of their watered stock in order that it may share directly in the profits of the exactions that it licenses them to impose upon the people of New York.

The committee has reported two bills, the first of which prohibits the transfer of this thirty-five per cent to the Bell company in the future and forbids stock watering, while the second limits the charge for telephone service within half a mile of the central office to \$6.50 per month, but authorizes a further charge of \$2 per month for each half mile or fractional part thereof beyond the limit first mentioned. The objection to the latter bill is that it actually authorizes an increase on existing charges, while the first, if effective, would afford one set of monopolists relief from the extortion practiced on it by another set, and do really nothing for the people. What is essential is not larger profits for local telephone companies, but a material reduction in the charges that are imposed on the public for the use of telephones.

We must look to Washington rather than to Albany for relief from the telephone monopoly. The telephone will quickly come under the control of a postal telegraph department of the government, after such department is established; but even if that were not the case, it is to national and not to state law that we must look as the source of this and many other of our worst monopolies. They are built on tariffs or patents, and the hope of relief lies in congressional action. It is very well for an enlightened government to foster invention by patent laws, but it is bound to discover some means of doing this without at the same time establishing monopolies that rob the people of almost the entire benefit of such inventions, while proving to the great majority of inventors nothing but a delusion and a snare. It is preposterous for us to idly cry out against the exactions created by statute without inquiring into the wisdom and utility of such statutes. This custom of making foolish laws that produce evil effects, and then legislating to ameliorate these evil effects, has been pushed to the extreme of absurdity. It is time that we had begun to accustom ourselves to go back to the beginning, with a view to making a new and a better start. We should then have fewer laws and more justice.

#### A NEW PACIFIC RAILROAD PLOT.

Still other modifications have been made in the proposed legislation for the relief of the Union and Central Pacific railroad companies. These modifications have been made at the instance of Charles Francis Adams, president of the Union Pacific, and they reduce the amount of annual payments at first to be made in order to release the companies from their present obligations to the government. Some additional security is contemplated, but it is to consist of mortgages on the land values that the growth of population in Omaha, Denver and other cities will create. As has already been pointed out by THE STANDARD, this security will not amount to much if the people of those cities should during the next fifty years awake to a practical recognition of the fact that the values that they thus create should go by right into their own common treasury.

Again, there is a strong feeling at Wash-

ington that Charles Francis Adams is one of the truly good, and that anything he asks in the name of the Union Pacific, after rescuing it from the hands of that bad man, Jay Gould, ought to be done, even though those other bad men, Stanford, Huntington and Crocker, profit by it. This is queer, since congress can have no possible assurance that at the very next annual election Mr. Adams may not be succeeded by a Central Pacific wrecker, or even by Jay Gould himself. Any one wanting a controlling interest in Union Pacific could easily buy it if he had money enough. What then has the supposed virtue of Charles Francis Adams to do with the matter?

There is but one proper course for congress to pursue. These roads were built with government money and they were dishonestly acquired by private parties. That the money has been wasted and stolen is not denied, and it is this money that is represented in the existing stock. The companies must, in the course of a few years, default on their obligations to the government. All congress has to do is to leave them alone, and when the default comes let the government take the roads. All these proposals to extend the time for payment of the loan are dishonest. The people making them have no idea of paying anything either now or during the next fifty years. What they propose is that the government shall lend them its credit and confirm them in the possession of property that does not rightfully belong to them. They promise that if it will do this they will do their best during the next fifty years to squeeze enough money out of the people of this country to enable them to make good the lost money represented by their own stock and to pay the principal of the government loan also, if they can. Such a proposition ought not to be even considered. These men have robbed the people of certain states and territories long enough. Let the government take its roads out of their hands and give those overtaxed people a chance to get their freight carried at a reasonable price, without paying for other men's losses.

#### A POSTAL TELEGRAPH BILL.

The house committee on commerce is disposed to deal much more radically than the senate post office committee with Jay Gould's telegraph monopoly. The committee's report declares that the control of telegraphy throughout this country has fallen into the hands of "the worst and most dangerous" of existing monopolies, one that is "substantially owned and controlled by one man." It comments severely on the efforts of the Western Union company to prevent action by congress, and strongly affirms the constitutional power of congress to establish a postal telegraph. The committee scouts the idea that the government is under any conceivable obligation to purchase existing lines, and declares that "of all corporations in this country" the Western Union company "is the last one which ought to talk about vested rights, when it has never hesitated to destroy and annihilate them in every instance where it has met with competition or encountered opposition."

The committee therefore reports in favor of building a postal telegraph line, and submits a bill providing that the secretary of war shall acquire by purchase the right of way for such a line and proceed to build the same, the lines when built to become a part of the postal system of the United States under the immediate control of a fourth assistant postmaster general, which office is created by the act. The bill appropriates \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending next June toward building such lines. The introduction of this bill and the tabling of the senate bill providing for the mere supervision of Jay Gould's monopoly give some reason to hope that the present congress may really accomplish something in this direction.

The only objection urged against the establishment of a postal telegraph, aside from the objections inspired by the monopoly, is the fear that the change will unduly enlarge the patronage of the government before civil service reform is sufficiently well established. If this is the only objection the friends of the measure should cheerfully assent to the addition of an ironclad provision for the competitive examination of applicants for positions. Most pronounced of spoilsmen could not object to this, for no one wants to run any risk of having telegrams handled by incompetent operators.

The proposed bill is a good measure in itself. It will provide a needed public convenience, strike a fatal blow at the insolent and dishonest Western Union monopoly and weaken the allied monopoly of the Associated Press, which at least has the power to throw serious obstacles in the way of the establishment of any real anti-monopoly daily journal. The indirect advantages of the establishment of a postal telegraph will be enormous. It will be the first step toward the resumption by government of the powers it has unwisely delegated to private corporations. It will not need many more such complications as have been brought about by the recent quarrel between engineers and railway corporations in the west to show the public that it cannot afford to leave these great highways of commerce under private control, and the acquisition of the telegraphs will pave the way for the government ownership and control of the railway system. If this congress will take away the taxing power now exercised by Jay Gould, curtail the use of governmental taxing power for individual benefit, and refuse to pass the pending bills to surrender the people's property to the Pacific railroad companies, it will de-

serve grateful recognition for the long stride it will have taken toward denying all taxing powers to individuals and relieving governments from the necessity of imposing taxes on any product of human industry.

#### VANITY OF VANITIES.

In this skeptical age most of those engaged in the eager race for wealth would probably answer St. Mark's question, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" by the old adage, "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." The very same men might, however, give a different answer to the question as it is translated in the new version, "For what doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his life?" or if it were put in a more practical form still, and men were asked, "What is the use of amassing millions if they bring no pleasure or contentment?"

That these are practical questions is known to thousands of men in our money markets, but now and then some fact crops out that brings the folly of this greed for millions home to men. Last summer a New York millionaire died in a distant island, whither he had gone in search of that which his millions could not buy—health. He was a man who in early life had felt what misfortunes and straitened circumstances meant to men of his class. He was fond of sport, a genial companion, a faithful friend, and his fame as a wit extended beyond his own country. He prospered in speculation, and became many times a millionaire. If great wealth could bring joy and content to any man, here was such a man. But the trouble was that he could never reach the point where, in his own opinion, acquisition ought to stop and well earned repose begin. Two winters before his death an eminent physician, who was his intimate friend, told this man that nothing but an immediate cessation of work and worry could save him from a fatal malady with which he was threatened. The millionaire pleaded for an assurance that he might safely take time to close up a few negotiations then pending, but his friend was inexorable. A family physician was more yielding in judgment, and the millionaire took the time to close up his transactions. By the time he had finished it was too late, and he spent eighteen months trying to escape the inevitable, and then died. What would have been that man's answer in his last hours to the question, "What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his life?"

Two or three years ago Mr. Flood, one of California's bonanza kings, was worth \$40,000,000, most of which he had gained quickly and by means not at all creditable. Last summer Mackey and Flood lost between them \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 in a gigantic wheat speculation. The two men quarreled over the settlement of these losses and Flood suddenly determined to unload all speculative stocks and invest his money in something more stable, and he dumped the stocks on the San Francisco market without warning, and the result was that they sold lower than any one imagined possible. This still further demoralized Flood, and his condition is described as pitiful. Though still enormously rich he is oppressed with a fear that he will die a pauper. He trembles with horror at the bare thought of poverty, and spends sleepless nights in imagining ways in which his remaining millions may slip from his grasp. There is but one escape from this condition of mind in life, and that escape is madness. What has it availed this bonanza king to amass the millions that he cannot enjoy? Success has not even relieved him of that horrid fear of poverty that goaded him on in his race for riches.

It is not alone to the poor that a change that abolishes the fear of want and the danger of poverty will bring the choicest of blessings.

The friends of tariff reform in the house of representatives begin to hope that the Mills bill can be carried through that body. Ever since the tariff reformers succeeded in electing Kerr as speaker in 1876 the strength of the Randall following has steadily diminished. Nearly half of the democrats were then protectionists or opposed to any attempt to revise the tariff. Six years ago, when Carlisle was first elected speaker, Randall's followers numbered forty. The number of these unprotected republicans is now estimated at eighteen, with a diminishing tendency. If they all stand with Randall there will remain but 150 out of the 168 democrats in the house to vote for the bill. Of the four independents, two are expected to vote for and two against the bill. Of the republicans, Nelson and Lind of Minnesota, Fuller of Iowa, and Fitch of New York, are expected to vote with the revenue reformers. If this calculation holds good, the bill will get 136 votes, which is within seven of a majority, and it is likely that the rapidly increasing evidences of a popular demand for the reduction of duties will secure that number before the vote is taken.

One of the most significant features of the situation is the lack of unanimity among republicans. The leaders of that party have patted Randall on the back, sarcastically consoled with the democrats on the unfortunate division of sentiment in their ranks, and loftily assumed that all good republicans would stand together as one man in support of a high tariff—the higher the better. It is now reported, however, that northwestern republicans will not help in relieving whisky and tobacco from taxation while a tremendous tax is imposed on sugar. Mr. McKinley of Ohio, says the New York Times, prepared to

head off the tariff reduction bill by a resolution repealing all taxes on tobacco, but was amazed to find that no less than fifty republicans would vote against such a resolution. Mr. Reed of Maine is reported on the same authority to have made a similar discovery concerning a project of his own for repealing the tobacco tax and lowering that on whisky. The western republicans would not touch it. This was to be expected. The farmers of Minnesota, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska and Kansas have been chafing for a long time under the burdens imposed upon them by the tariff, yet they have consented to endorse them for the sake of the party. If it is shown to these men, however, that the only aim and object of their party is the maintenance of these very burdens, there is among western politicians a well grounded fear that their constituents may take to democracy, prohibition or the woods rather than submit. No wonder under such circumstances that western republican congressmen begin to doubt the wisdom of accepting the full Pennsylvania policy at this juncture. Thus the probability grows that enough republican support can be had to pass the Mills bill. This would be a matter for present rejoicing, but of little difference in the long run. The greater the resistance the more sweeping will be the flood when it does come.

The statements concerning republican dissension on the tariff question are partially confirmed by the well-informed Washington correspondence of the *Herald*, and, despite republican denials, there is probably enough truth in them to prevent Mr. Randall's scheme of how not to do it from receiving any republican support. Farming communities with a strong bias toward prohibition are not likely to look favorably on a proposition to abolish all taxes on tobacco and reduce the whisky tax one-half for the express purpose of maintaining a high tariff on the necessities of life. However much of a sham Mr. Randall's bill may be, it is nevertheless the official confession of this democratic representative of protected monopolists that public opinion has made such a demand for tariff reform that at least a pretense of conceding something to it must be shown.

The Mills bill may possibly undergo some modification before it is officially reported, but any change will probably be made with a view to striking a heavier blow at protection. The provisions that are most generally criticised are those relating to sugar. It is urged with much force that unless the duties on refined sugar are very materially lowered that the large reduction on raw sugar proposed will inure almost entirely to the advantage of the trust now controlling the refinery industry, and a popular demand is rapidly rising for the killing of the sugar trust by the abolition of sugar duties.

The lecture of Bishop John F. Hurst of the Methodist church, delivered before the general Christian conference of the evangelical alliance in Washington last December, is published in full in the *Christian Advocate* of March 8. Its subject is "The Estrangement of the Masses from the Church." Among the reasons given by the bishop for the estrangement of the working masses is that "the typical wage earner is taught by the apostles of dynamite and free land that the man who lives in his own house and has enough to support himself without manual labor is his bitter foe." It is no wonder that workmen are estranged from a church whose high priests, to please front pew pharisees, are guilty of the mendacity of which this quotation is a typical expression. Bishop Hurst, in preparing his lecture, forgot that a lie, though sanctified by a bishop, is none the less a lie.

Senator Vedder has introduced a bill to tax trusts, but under the form of taxing them the bill actually legalizes these conspiracies, which, in the absence of any such legislation, are now possibly under the ban of the law. In the present condition of public opinion any such attempt as that of Mr. Vedder will provoke general indignation. Yet this effort to help the monopolists, while pretending to aim a blow at them, shows that the corporations are quite as well represented as the people at Albany.

The recent savage and senseless attack by Senator Ingalls on the president and on the memory of Generals Hancock and McClellan has met a reception which shows that appeals to war passions and sectional prejudices are no longer helps to popularity. This is a good thing in itself, and it is also a gratifying proof that dead issues can no longer be used to divert attention from the pressing economic questions that now demand the gravest consideration.

Right on the heels of the investigation of the envelope trust comes the publication of a circular issued by one of the firms in the combination, urging stationers and printers to use all their influence to discourage the use of government stamped envelopes. The government is denounced as a monopoly by this member of a trust, and the people are asked to boycott it in the interest of a private monopoly! The effect ought to be to increase the sale of stamped envelopes.

There is a project on foot to build a tunnel under the East river connecting this city and Brooklyn, and to so extend it as to establish an extensive system of underground rapid transit. It is now rumored that the aldermen sent "boulders" in the

project, and are forming a new "combine" to demand a large bribe for granting to the projectors the privilege of burrowing beneath the city. This is only natural. The ground of the island from the surface to the center of the earth belongs of right to the people inhabiting it. If some private individuals are permitted to appropriate it without making due compensation to the owners, why should not other men seek to share in the proceeds of the theft. The community must cease to sanction robbery, if it would put an end to the rapacity of thieving aldermen.

The London *Christian Commonwealth* has established an anti-poverty department, into which it gathers news of the single tax movement. The *Commonwealth* gives the movement its support, and includes under the anti-poverty head the amusing interview of Donald Macrae in the London *Star*, reprinted elsewhere in this issue of THE STANDARD. It will be seen that the grace ends thus: "And then when the land shall be restored to us we will give Thee all the glory." When Scotch Highlanders thus get the land question into their prayers and graces there is no danger that there will ever be with them even the shadow of turning.

The prospect of James Redpath's recovery after five strokes of paralysis is as gratifying as it is unexpected; but such a recovery is only possible on the condition of rest and quiet. Like most men of his impulsive and generous disposition, Mr. Redpath is not in a position to enable him to take the rest so essential without pecuniary worry. Not stopping to consult him, the Twilight club have therefore set on foot a subscription to send Mr. Redpath to Florida, and give him a long holiday in which to recuperate. His many friends will be glad to have this opportunity to testify their regard for a man whose time and money has ever been at the service of every generous cause. Contributions can be sent to Mr. Charles E. Wingate, secretary of the Twilight club, 119 Pearl street, New York.

#### Miss Taylor Will Not Come to This Country at Present.

The following cable dispatch has been received from Miss Taylor:

LONDON.—To Henry George, STANDARD Office, New York: Please announce in THE STANDARD from me that circumstances connected with the Washington convention have decided me to withdraw my acceptance of invitation.

HELEN TAYLOR.

#### What an American Traveler Learned Abroad.

An interesting book of foreign travel, entitled "A Tramp Trip," by Lee Meriwether (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1887), contains in the appendix the following passage:

I recrossed the ocean in midsummer and before leaving London had made to order by a fashionable tailor a heavy melon coat. It cost \$16; in America \$40 would have been the price.

On arriving in New York I stood on the platform of a Third Avenue surface car and talked with the driver, a worried looking man, his face pinched with cold, his overcoat, like Nanki-poo's, was a "thing of shreds and patches." Presently he addressed me:

"I would like to ask you, sir," he said, "how much you gave for that coat?"

"Sixteen dollars,"

His eyes opened with astonishment. "Sixteen dollars! Why, this thing of mine cost eighteen." Tell me where did you get your coat?

"In London."

The poor fellow turned to his horses sadly disappointed.

Protectionists talk of the horrors of an "inundation" of English goods. As I looked at the shivering car driver it seemed a pity he could not be "inundated" by a good warm overcoat. That car driver works thirteen or fourteen hours a day for \$2. If his clothing, fuel and other necessities were reduced fifty per cent in price he could live on fifty per cent less than he now spends; he could afford to work fewer hours and have a little time to pass with his family. But protectionists oppose such a reduction on the ground that free trade means pauper wages and tariffs mean high wages.

Investigation showed me that that country in Europe with least protection pays most wages. England—England with its royalty, its endless red tape, its idle aristocracy, its army of useless officials—England, alone of all monarchies forms of governments, pays its laboring classes living wages, and England alone has free trade. America, with all its abundance of land, its democratic and comparatively inexpensive government, its sparsity of population—over a favored America is pulling behind that little island in the sea, is taking a second place, when her natural advantages entitle her to the very foremost seat among the nations. Formerly we had the lion's share of the carrying trade of the world. What have we now? When I saw an American vessel I stared at it curiously, so great a rarity was it amid the forest of masts of vessels belonging to other countries.

The author has prepared two tables, one showing wages received in protected Italy, Germany, etc.; the other showing the amount of tariffs imposed upon certain articles by different European states, concerning which he says:

Let the protectionist read these tables and say why, if protection protects, if tariffs make high wages, the protected states of Europe are in so impoverished a condition. If free trade causes stagnation and low wages, why is England so far ahead of her protected European competitors—so far ahead of her own condition forty years ago, before she had the sense to adopt a free trade policy?

Until these questions are answered, the thoughtful student cannot but ask himself, "Does protection protect?"

#### The Lesson of a Millionaire's Philanthropy.

NEW YORK CITY.—Please permit me to make a few comments on the following extract from the *World's* obituary article on the late Mr. Corcoran:

The large fortune of Mr. Corcoran was accumulated entirely by the legitimate operations of his profession as a banker. He made with his surplus capital judicious investments in real estate, and to this source more perhaps than to any other he owed the great wealth of which he came to be possessed. He held great landed possessions in nearly every state of the Union, especially in what were the "new states" at a not very remote epoch of our history, before he had retired from business. The extent and variety of these

possessions arose from the fact that at one time he became a purchaser, for a given sum, of all the lands then owned by the treasury of the United States which had been seized for debts due to the government. We shall subsequently see how extensive these landed possessions were in some of the states, and how freely he gave away his broad acres in the cause of charity.

Note the beautiful non sequitur between the statement, "the large fortune of Mr. Corcoran was accumulated entirely by the legitimate operations of his profession as a banker" and "he made with his surplus capital judicious investments in real estate, and to this source more, perhaps, than to any other, he owed the great wealth of which he came to be possessed."

The cat is let out of the bag by the statement that at one time he purchased all the lands owned by the treasury of the United States. Suppose the then treasurer had simply leased the lands to Mr. Corcoran instead of selling them to him, and had kept on increasing the great population in the "new states" increased, where would Mr. Corcoran have gotten his millions from to endow his charities? What sort of an art gallery could the people of the United States have built with the money at Washington without being beholden to anybody? How many institutions similar to the "Louise home" could have been erected where indigent "gentlewomen" would have a right to be cared for, not merely to be begged for?

J. R. ABRAHAM.

#### Land Scarce, Labor and Capital Abundant.

In the course of an address at the last meeting of the anti-poverty society of Cincinnati Dr. Alfred S. Houghton said:

Now, the unemployed labor of this country numbers over 2,000,000 of men, and is the greatest menace to our institutions and the greatest disgrace to our boasted civilization that we have. Unemployed men, what do they require to employ themselves? Capital! There is plenty of it to be had at four per cent per annum. But given capital in unlimited amounts, what could capital and labor do without each other? Then you say, there is plenty of land to be had for nothing. Land to be had for nothing is not worth anything. Every acre of land in this country commands an annual rent, or is held by speculators until such time as it will equal to its annual production, minus the lowest rate of interest and the lowest rate of wages that will tempt capital to engage in production, and enable labor to sustain life. That is why we want to abolish the private ownership of land as it now exists, but the private abuse of land as property. It explains why the Incas had no poverty, because they had no monopoly, for all monopoly rests upon the private monopolization of land. The habits and customs of this inherited, the offspring of greed and selfishness. But the rent of land is a very different thing from the rent of a house. Houses are built by labor, and depend for their value on the amount of labor put into them, and the labor that built them is entitled to the rent of the house. But the land was not built by labor, and its value is due to the whole community, and is correctly measured by its annual rent; hence, to confer the rent of land on the community is simply to restore to the community what it has created, and thus practically abolishing land ownership.

#### It was Printed in The Standard of July 19.

NEW YORK CITY.—Please inform me what issue of THE STANDARD contains Dr. McGlynn's excommunication sermon.

S. G.

#### Suffering from the Results of Last Year's Springfield, Mass., Union.

Life in the wide, woolly west is not all that it is painted by the people who go there to stay, determined to grow up with the boom. A young house keeper, who has just returned to Massachusetts after a year's life in Omaha, where she saw the average sort of life, can hardly tell how glad she is to get back to where people have things as they want them. Rents are very high in Omaha for tenements which would hardly be regarded as habitable in Springfield. In Omaha, the rent of a house with no water in the house and not even a sink rents readily for \$40 per month, and the tenants are liable to be hustled out as soon as the landlord thinks he can afford to pull down the house and build a better one. They have the constant appearance of being "ready to move on." Omaha, as well as many other western towns and cities, is now suffering from the results of last year's land boom. There is very little more to be gained in speculation and general business is very dull. Everything is tied up in real estate and must stay there till the boom can start up again.

#### Three Lives.

London Democrat.

Any one who wishes to study a peculiar phase of the land laws in England should visit a little town called Torpoint, in Cornwall, situated opposite Devonport, in Devon. He will there find that an epidemic, especially among children, is a substantial pecuniary gain to the owner of the land, and that the town stands. This is not the theory, but actually occurs, and, indeed, took place not very long ago. The reason is this: the land is held, chiefly by cottagers and small householders, on the three-tens system of leases, with power of renewal. That is to say, the lease is for as long as three persons mentioned in it shall live; and naturally the youngest lives are selected. If one of the parties named should die, and the lease be renewed, that is, of nominating another life, not "flines," "heretics," and other antiquated charges have to be paid to the landlord on such an occasion, and he also insists upon the premises being renovated and repaired at the leaseholder's expense. If the poor cottagers cannot pay the charges and repair the building, he forfeits his lease. The landlord is thus like Tommy Dodd; whichever way things go he is "sure to win." It is a very cruel arrangement, and is especially hard upon an epidemic. Rachel may weep for her children, but the landlord will not. His coffers are replenished.

#### Rich and Poor.

Mrs. Williams, the wife of a Wiltshire landlord, stole several articles from Weymouth tradesmen. Her thefts extended over a period of three months, and in the case of one tradesman amounted to the value of fifteen pounds. She was discharged upon her husband entering into recognizance for her good behavior. John Rabbit, a fisherman, fished up a hare which had been hunted into the water. He was charged with "killing a hare," it was shown that the hare was dead before he touched it, but the bench fined him 2s. 6d. and 12s. 6d. costs.

#### Alabama Merchants Rebel! Against the Kent Tax.

Memphis Letter in Birmingham Ala., Chronicle.

The rents now being wrung from merchants in this city by merciless landlords, amounts almost to confiscation, and it is surprising that they have submitted as long as they have. But there is a point at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue, and in my humble opinion the time has come for us to rise up and demand that rents be placed at a figure at which we can live. There is no justice in levying upon our outrageous rents for the purpose of paying interest on fictitious valuations of real estate.

#### What It Means.

Temple Post.

The single tax theories all summed up simply mean that you have as much right to live as I, and my right is as sacred as yours. The absolute equality of man is the rock upon which is a superstructure of free land.







## THE WORSHIP OF ISTAR.

Let us be under no illusions, then. So long as unlimited multiplication goes on, no social organization which has ever been devised, or is likely to be devised, no fiddle-faddling with the distribution of wealth, will deliver society from the tendency to be destroyed by the reproduction within itself, in its intensest form, of that struggle for existence, the limitation of which is the object of society. And however shocking to the moral sense this eternal competition of man against man and of nation against nation may be, however revolting may be the accumulation of misery at the negative pole of society, in contrast with that of monstrous wealth at the positive pole; this state of things must abide and grow continually worse, so long as Istar holds her way unchecked. It is the true riddle of the Sphinx, and every nation which does not solve it will sooner or later be devoured by the monster itself has generated.

These are the words of Professor T. H. Huxley in an article on "The Struggle for Existence" in the *Nineteenth Century* for February. Professor Huxley occupies a leading position among teachers of exact science. His influence upon modern thought has been exceptionally great. To his observations and arguments is largely due the radical change which has taken place within the last generation in our conception of the physical universe. He is one of that small band of philosophic students of nature who have taught mankind to regard the universe as a harmonious whole, and to perceive, behind apparently contradictory phenomena, a single, all-controlling law. He is an apostle of the doctrine of evolution. When such a man comes forth from his laboratory, surveys the social situation, and gives us not only a diagnosis of the disease with which he finds us suffering, but a prognosis of its course, and advice for its treatment, the least we can do is to listen respectfully, and to carefully perpend.

As, when into the current of a swiftly flowing river, an equally rapid stream projects itself at right angles, there ensue whirlpools, bubblings, aqueous disturbances of various kinds; so, according to Professor Huxley, our present troubles are due to the interference of ethical principles, made necessary and fostered by our social organization, with the strong current of non-moral evolution. In the professor's own words, "the course shaped by the ethical man—the member of society or citizen—necessarily runs counter to that which the non-ethical man—the primitive savage, or man as a mere member of the animal kingdom—tends to adopt. The latter fights out the struggle to the bitter end, like any other animal; the former devotes his best energies to the object of setting limits to the struggle."

But the effort of ethical man to work toward a moral end by means abolished, perhaps hardly modified, the deep seated organic impulses which impel the natural man to follow his non-moral course. One of the most essential conditions, if not the chief cause, of the struggle for existence, is the tendency to multiply without limit, which man shares with all living things. It is notable that "increase and multiply" is a commandment traditionally much older than the ten, and that it is, perhaps, the only one which has been spontaneously and *ex animo* obeyed by the great majority of the human race. But in civilized society the inevitable result of such obedience is the re-establishment, in all its intensity, of that struggle for existence—the war of each against all—the mitigation or abolition of which was the chief end of social organization.

Istar, the impassive one, who knows neither good nor evil, is avenging herself upon us who have defied her. We have checked infanticide. We have diminished the ravages of pestilence and famine. We have lengthened the span of human life. We have established our hospitals and almshouses, our free soup charities, our woodward charities, our prisons and reformatories. We have, to some extent, enabled the weakest to survive. And Istar smiles—a smile in which is neither mirth nor pity, but only the calm mockery of relentless fate—and puts forth her hand and grasps her victims just the same! She says to us: "You want to save alive those weaklings who should be my natural victims! Then I will take the stronger ones, whom otherwise I should have spared. You want more men to live! Let them live! But the suffering that should have been theirs in sharp quick pangs of death, shall be endured by the entire race—to each his share!"

It is conceivable that at some period in the history of the fabled Atlantis the production of food should have been exactly sufficient to meet the wants of the population, that the makers of artificial commodities should have amounted to just the number supportable by the surplus food of the agriculturists. And, as there is no harm in adding another monstrous supposition to the foregoing, let it be imagined that every man, woman and child was perfectly virtuous, and aimed at the good of all as the highest personal good. In that happy land the natural man would have been finally put down by the ethical man. There would have been no competition, but the industry of each would have been serviceable to all; nobody being vain and nobody avaricious, there would have been no rivalries; the struggle for existence would have been abolished and the millennium would have finally set in. But it is obvious that this state of things could have been permanent only with a stationary population. Add ten fresh mouths, and as by the supposition, there was only exactly enough before, some body must go on short rations. The Atlantis society might have been a heaven upon earth, the whole nation might have consisted of just men needing no repentance, and yet somebody must starve. Reckless Istar, non-moral Nature, would have given the social fabric.

Such is Professor Huxley's diagnosis of the world wide social disease—a constant struggle between the ethical ambitions of society—the desire to increase happiness and abolish wrong and suffering—and the non-ethical, inexorable laws of nature. Nor is his prognosis a hopeful one. To the vast majority of mankind the disease will be fatal.

According to Professor Huxley, as social organization renders more and more impossible the actual physical struggle between individual men for the privilege of existence, there will arise—indeed there has already arisen—a struggle between communities. In one way or another, industrially or with arms in hand, nation is to strive against nation, and the fittest

shall survive. So shall Istar triumph and the great principle of evolution be fittingly vindicated. And having determined this point, having shown the hopeless folly of attempting to do anything for humanity at large, Professor Huxley finds the field of his inquiry marvellously narrowed. There is no hope for mankind, but there is hope for some men. One nation at least may be saved, and why shouldn't that nation be Great Britain?

It would be folly to entertain any ill feeling toward those neighbors and rivals who, like ourselves, are slaves of Istar; but, if somebody is to be saved, the modern world has no oracle of Delphi to which the nation can appeal for an indication of the victim. It is open to us to try our fortune, and if we avoid impending fate, there will be a certain ground for believing that we are the right people to escape.

## Says Professor Huxley:

There are now 36,000,000 of people in our island, and every year considerably more than 300,000 are added to our numbers. That is to say, about every hundred seconds or so, a new claimant to share in the common stock of maintenance presents him or herself among us. At the present time the produce of the soil does not suffice to feed half its population. The other moiety has to be supplied with food which must be bought from the people of food-producing countries. That is to say, we have to offer them the things which they want in exchange for the things we want. And the things they want and which we can produce better than they can are mainly manufactures—industrial products.

The insolent reproach of the first Napoleon had a very solid foundation. We not only are, but, under penalty of starvation, we are bound to be, a nation of shopkeepers. But other nations also lie under the same necessity of keeping shop, and some of them deal in the same goods as ourselves. Our customers naturally seek to get the most and the best in exchange for their goods. If our goods are inferior to those of our competitors, there is no ground compatible with the sanity of the buyers, which can be alleged, why they should not prefer the latter. And, if that result should ever take place on a large and general scale, five or six millions of us would soon have nothing to eat. We know what the cotton famine was; and we can therefore form some notion of what a dearth of customers would be.

And so the problem for Great Britain to solve is simply this: By what means can she continuously produce better goods than her neighbors and offer them for sale at lower prices to the food producing countries who want to buy them. If she can find the answer to the conundrum she may survive and flourish, and contemplate with philosophic pity the downfall of France, Germany, the United States, and other nations who also want to make things in exchange for food. If she can not find the answer, why then five or six millions of Englishmen must die of starvation, and Istar will get square with John Bull. The matter is one of national life or death; and if Professor Huxley has succeeded in finding the answer, one is tempted to wonder why he did not communicate it in confidence to the constituted authorities of Britain rather than publish it to the world.

Two things, Professor Huxley tells us, are necessary to the maintenance of British commercial supremacy. The first and most obvious one is that "our produce shall be better than that of others."

There is only one reason why our goods should be preferred to those of our rivals—our customers must find them better at the price. That means that we must use more knowledge, skill and industry in producing them, without a proportionate increase in the cost of production; and as the price of labor constitutes a large element in that cost, the rate of wages must be restricted within certain limits. It is perfectly true that cheap production and cheap labor are by no means synonymous; but it is also true that wages cannot increase beyond a certain proportion without destroying cheapness. Cheapness, then, with, as part and parcel of cheapness, a moderate price of labor, is essential to our success as competitors in the markets of the world.

The second condition of success is that while Great Britain shall be thus working out her industrial salvation, the struggle for existence shall be practically abolished within her borders and the demon of poverty held at bay.

It needs no argument to prove that when the price of labor sinks below a certain point, the worker infallibly falls into that condition which the French emphatically call *la misère*—a word for which I do not think there is an exact English equivalent. It is a condition in which the food, warmth and clothing which are necessary for the mere maintenance of the functions of the body in their normal state cannot be obtained; in which men, women and children are forced to crowd into dens wherein decency is abolished, and the most ordinary conditions of healthful existence are impossible of attainment; in which the pleasures within reach are reduced to bestiality and drunkenness; in which the pains accumulate at compound interest, in the shape of starvation, disease, stunted development and moral degradation; in which the prospect of even steady and honest industry is a life of unsuccessful battling with hunger, rounded by a pauper's grave. . . . Argumentation can hardly be useful to make it clear that no society in which the elements of decomposition are thus swiftly and surely accumulating can hope to win in the race of industries.

So! Goods are to be cheap, but of good quality; wages are to be low, but not too low; and the slough of poverty is to be so far filled in that the masses of Englishmen may find therein a tolerably firm footing—not comfortable, but yet not absolutely unendurable. How is all this to be accomplished? Very simply. It may be done by the establishment of technical schools, in which instructions shall be given "in the principles of those branches of science and of art which are peculiarly applicable to industrial pursuits, which may be called preliminary scientific education." Since Eliza prescribed for the leprosy of Naaman never was a simpler remedy offered for a terrible disorder.

Professor Huxley would probably repel with scorn any attempt to class him among the advocates of the protective tariff system; but his essay from which I have quoted contains the essence of the defense of the protective principle as could be made. For what our apostles of protection claim is simply what Professor Huxley claims, to wit, that some men must starve that other men may eat, and that the only proper national policy is that which forces foreigners to do the starving.

Indeed, our American protectionists have long since ranged themselves by the professor's side. Their chief argument for protection in America is that Great Britain must find a market for her manufactures or perish from among the nations; and there is no sort of doubt that much of the support given them comes from men whose object is not so much to benefit this country as to have England perish. Were Professor Huxley an American instead of an Englishman, the same line of argument that now leads him to see the salvation of Great Britain in technical schools would force him to advocate a protective tariff as the only means of salvation for America.

But is it so, indeed? Can it be true that the doctrine of evolution has nothing better to offer as its ultimate than a world full of war and commotion and suffering, in which nation shall be striving with nation, civilizations rising and falling, the weakest going to the wall, and the devil forever taking the hindmost? Is this earth altogether under the dominion of Istar, the blind, all-seeing, ignorant, all-knowing, passionately passionless goddess of doom, or has the universe been planned by an intelligence that wills that through successive stages all creation shall advance toward a nobler harmony, a more divine perfection of happiness and peace? Was the Christ who urged that men should do unto others as they would others should do unto them simply an accidental and utterly abortive variation of humanity, or did his teachings mark a distinct advance along the line on which mankind are destined to move until they reach their highest moral development? Professor Huxley prostrates himself before Istar and derides the Christ. If he be right, then science is but a pretty plaything, a dime museum which men waste their time in visiting. What shall it profit mankind that they have called the lightning from heaven to run their errands, and dragged imprisoned sunbeams from the earth to labor in their mills and on their roads, if the only result is to be that the struggle for existence shall be made fiercer, and the inevitable end be brought more near. If the true philosophy of life is that we should rejoice in each other's misfortunes, and count as a gain only their losses which we have torn from other men, then the human ideal should be the savage Indian, alternating absolute idleness with predatory warpath, rather than a civilization that will bring man in harmony with his fellows.

Fortunately Professor Huxley gives us, quite unintentionally, the clue to the logical processes which have led him so amazingly astray. Having decided that salvation lies in technical education, he goes on to demonstrate the right of the state to impose taxes for that purpose; and in doing this he has occasion to define the status and rights of the individual man. This is what he says of himself:

I cannot speak of my own knowledge, but I have every reason to believe that I came into this world a small, reddish person, certainly without a gold spoon in my mouth, and in fact with no discernible abstract or concrete rights of any description. If a foot was not at once set upon me as a squalling nuisance, it was either the natural affection of those about me, which I certainly had done nothing to deserve, or the fear of the law which, ages before my birth, was painfully kept up by the society into which I intruded, that prevented that catastrophe. If I was nourished, cared for, taught, saved from the vagabondage of a waster, I certainly am not aware that I did anything to deserve those advantages. And if I possess anything now, it strikes me that though I may have fairly earned my day's wages for my day's work and may justly call them my property—yet, without that organization of society, created out of the toil and blood of long generations before my time, I should probably have had nothing but a flint ax and an indifferent tool to call my own; and even those would have been only so long as no stronger savage came my way.

In the light of this extraordinary paragraph it is easy to see the chain of argument by which Professor Huxley has reached his protectionist conclusions. If a child born into the world really is simply "a small, reddish person" without rights of any description, whom to extirpate as a squalling nuisance would be, albeit illegal, not at all immoral, then the whole argument follows. For such a child, like a rattlesnake, would have no right to existence save on one of two conditions; either he must be able to maintain it by fighting for it, or he must be given the means of maintaining it by somebody already possessed of them. And as the vast majority of small, reddish persons are without friends to give them the means of maintaining existence, they must fight for it as best they may, either in such combinations as tariff leagues, trusts, trades unions, Knights of Labor, legislative bodies, corporations, gangs, or nations, or singly, as "free" workmen, gamblers, beggars, thieves, vagabonds, or paupers. If society allows them to fight openly the physically stronger will get the better of the weaker on the whole; if society forbids open violence the more cunning will survive. In either case Istar, the relentless, will claim her own, and the philosophy of Professor Huxley will be justified. If society suffers small, reddish persons without rights to intrude into the world, society must pay the penalty as surely as a boat load of shipwrecked sailors on short allowance must suffer added pangs if they take on board an extra man who brings no food at all. It's a west coast of Africa sort of philosophy, but there can be no doubt that it is strictly logical.

A small, reddish person without rights! Has the bird no right to the air through which it wings its flight, no right to the tree top in which it builds its nest, no right to the food it seeks and finds? And is the "small, reddish person" not of more value than many sparrows? Professor Huxley would perhaps answer that the bird's rights are conditional on the bird's power to maintain them by force or cunning; and that in that sense the "small, reddish person" also has rights. But the chief function of society, the very object of its existence, is to assure that men shall have their rights without the need of resorting to force or cunning. And the crime of society is that it fails to perform this function, that it protects the spoiler, that it allows the strong

to prey upon the weak, the armed man upon the defenseless. Where it should be a beneficent agency, enabling men to enjoy their common rights to the bounties of nature without interference, and at the same time to gain the immense advantages that come of co-operating and co-ordinating hands and thoughts, it has degraded itself into a blighting oppression, making of human knowledge and invention a chain to bind humanity. And therefore it is that the dread goddess Istar triumphs, and Professor Huxley, looking out upon the world from the windows of his laboratory, sees nothing but a hopeless paradoxical struggle between opposing forces—the soul of man struggling toward human brotherhood, and the inexorable laws of the universe beating it back.

Let Professor Huxley take a thought! The small, reddish person has a right—the right of the leaf on the tree, of the bird in the air, of the tiger in the jungle, of the fish in the sea—the right to an equal chance with his fellows! Joint heir of God's bounty, sent we know not whence, to abide a season on this planet and depart we know not whither, he has an equal right with every other small, reddish person, with every other living man, woman and child, to the usufruct of the earth. For him God stored the everlasting hills with coal and metals, unrolled the fruitful plains, and ordained the pleasant places of the earth—that he should use them freely, and departing on his journey, leave them for the joy and sustenance of succeeding generations. To deny it is a blasphemy. To fail to recognize it or take it into account is to neglect a chief factor in social evolution. Let but this right be acknowledged, and the evils which Professor Huxley sees, and those which he so dolefully forebodes, will alike vanish. For as surely as the bee seeks the clover, the crow the corn field, and the sparrow the barn yard or the busy street, each unhesitatingly and unerringly finding its way to the place where its desires can be satisfied with the least exertion, so surely will men diversify their occupations, each using his powers to the best advantage, when once the chains that shackle industry shall be taken off and the equal right of access to the bounties of nature be recognized in all men. In the wealth of his fellow man each will see the promise of his own gain, and find the incentive to his own exertion. Individuals and communities alike will be quick to learn that it is the wealth produced, and not that gained by fraud, force or device, that constitutes prosperity. And round happy firesides old men will tell to scarce believing children the story of the days when statesmen sought to win prosperity by making commerce a crime, and wise men bowed themselves before Istar and cunningly bethought them how they might sacrifice all other nations upon her bloody altar and so persuade her to spare their own. T. L. MCCREARY.

**A Cigar-maker on the Cigar Tax.**  
PHILADELPHIA.—I endorse the position of THE STANDARD that the taxes on tobacco and cigar-making are not in the interest of cigar-makers. President Straesser in trying to keep up the internal revenue tax is working for his own self interest, and not for the cigar-makers at large. Yet not satisfied with expressing his own views, he is compelling local unions to endorse a resolution passed in our last convention, asking congress to leave the present internal revenue as it is, under penalty of suspension from the International Union. The effect of this is to keep the cigar-makers at the mercy of the bosses, just contrary to what the union is organized for. It is clear that the organization of laboring men does not of itself solve the labor problem, and that little is accomplished by strikes. As the result of a strike many families suffer for the necessities of life, strong and healthy men leave their homes to travel and tramp over the country for work, and in some instances take other strikers' places, and then come back consumptive or become tramps. In many cases, after all this, the strike is lost. If we, the laboring men of this country, must strike let us strike at the real enemy through the ballot box.

But no average cigar-maker will go to the polls on election day and vote for that bungling protection and that infernal revenue system, and then go around and growl when he is out of work and kicks at the system that keeps him from employing himself. In many instances men have told me that if they could get a business they would go into business for themselves. Just think, in this free American country a man is required to furnish bonds for a legitimate business, while without getting a license or giving bonds other men can gamble on the necessities of life and rob the public.

There are always a great many cigar-makers out of work the whole year round, and especially this time of the year. Now there is an agitation going on in our unions for an out-of-work benefit. Just think, what an idea for such intelligent men to be contented with. What men ought to ask themselves is, why in a country like this any one should be out of work?

What is the cause, but monopoly, the monopoly of land, the monopoly of that which we create (ground rent). Land is the monopoly of the natural rights which the creator has given to all. Let us strike at that, and there would be no need either for strikes or out-of-work benefits.

PETER KART,  
1410 Frankford ave., Philadelphia.

**Before the Reform Club of Manistee, Mich.**  
MANISTEE, Mich.—The reform club of this city met on Tuesday night last, the subject for debate being the "land question." The meeting had been well announced in the local papers, and a large audience was present.

The discussion, though highly interesting to the citizens of Manistee, is scarcely worth repeating at length in the columns of THE STANDARD. It consisted mainly of an elucidation of elementary principles, and the poor man's house standing on an immensely valuable lot came prominently to the front. The objectors to the single tax system were Rev. P. B. Norman and T. B. Collins, and Messrs. W. R. Hall and App. M. Smith were very successful in confuting the objections.

At the next meeting of the club Rev. J. M. Walkley will discuss the tariff question with Mr. M. Gill.

Just So.  
Todd County, Minn., Argus.

Let taxes be removed from all kinds of personal property and put them all on the bare land alone. When the holder of wild land has to pay as heavy a tax as the farmer who improves the land and syndicates will go out of business.

## THE PROBLEM OF MUNICIPAL TAXATION.

**Professor Ely of Johns Hopkins Tells Us How the Burden of City Taxes Can Be Reduced Without Lessening Expenditures—Full Compensation Should Be Exact From Every Natural Monopoly.**  
Professor Ely in Baltimore Sun.

It is the commonest thing in the world for worthy citizens to write to their daily papers exhorting the city fathers to keep down expenses and reduce the tax rate, and the newspapers from time to time come out with headlines like this, "Retrenchment a Necessity." Yet, what good does it do? Expenditures continue to swell in our cities relatively faster than in our states or at Washington. While state expenditures double, municipal expenditures increase fourfold or more. Ohio may serve as an illustration. The expenses of the state increased about forty-six times in sixty years, and the local expenses one hundred times. I have yet to find one exception to this general rule that municipal expenditures increase faster than any other; perhaps I should say local expenditures, for I mean to include villages and other local political units as well as great cities.

It is well to say "reduce taxes," but it is said to no purpose unless it can be shown how taxes are to be reduced. Let us clear the ground—not by theorizing, but by examining a few facts which can be established beyond controversy.

It is a general supposition that the increase in the burden of taxation in our cities is due to corruption. This is doubtless a partial explanation, but very incomplete and imperfect. There are two European countries at least where municipal administration is above reproach in respect to integrity of officials, and these are England and Germany, whereas it may be said generally that in Europe municipal corruption is hardly one of the problems of the day. Nevertheless, it is true that the expenditures of European cities have increased in recent years with greater relative rapidity than those of American cities. This has been satisfactorily demonstrated by Dr. Simon N. Patten of Illinois in a monograph on the finances of American states and cities. This must not be misunderstood. The statement is not that the expenditures are as large as ours, but that the rate of increase for ten or fifteen years at least has been more rapid. This also is different from saying that the rate of taxation has increased correspondingly, for there are many other possible sources of revenue than taxes. Dr. Patten has also shown some other interesting facts bearing on this problem.

One is that democracy is not the cause of increased expenditures, as superficial observers so often suppose. European cities generally have at least some restrictions on the right of suffrage, yet their expenditures have increased more rapidly than our own. But there are American cities where the right of suffrage is given to all, and yet their expenditures are not so high. It is said that universal suffrage gives a vote to those who have no economic interests at stake in the community, and that they consequently vote away other people's money with reckless prodigality. Dr. Patten has shown, however, that in small northern towns, where the vast majority of voters are tax payers, the tax rates have increased more rapidly than in the large cities; further, he has given evidence to show that real estate speculators, by urging on untimely improvements, like sewers running into the country, as recently happened in Buffalo—have done more to raise taxes than the ignorant voter. The object of the real estate speculators is, of course, to keep a boom alive. Now, these are no fanciful theories; they are hard facts. What do they show? They show at least this: The general public has not gone deep enough in its attempts to explain the growing burden of taxation.

The true causes for the growth of municipal expenditures are after all not difficult to discover. The functions of the local political unit have been increasing more rapidly than those of either state governments or of the federal government. We hear a great deal about centralization. The truth is that, relatively speaking, we live in an age of decentralization. Our local political units are gaining in importance faster than our sovereign states or our sovereign federal government. I do not say that there is no tendency in our central governments to extend their functions. I say merely that relatively they do not hold their own in importance.

Sanitation and public schools are two great items in the budgets of cities. Light and water are two more, and in all these respects what satisfied us once is no longer tolerable. Public parks cost hundreds of thousands, and even millions in cities. New York city, for example, proposes to spend one million dollars a year to provide small parks in the most crowded portions of the metropolis, a measure demanded on sanitary no less than humanitarian grounds. Public libraries are maintained by a growing number of cities, and the expense of maintaining these is not insignificant. Boston spent over \$100,000 on her public library in a single year recently. Public baths are another thing which people are beginning to demand. I will again only remind the readers of the *Sun* that the city of New York defrays eighteen per cent of its expenditures from the profits on gas works with gas at less than one dollar a thousand. Since I wrote my article on gas supply the American consul at Leeds has told me that the people of that city are well supplied for forty-four cents a thousand.

The same principle holds good with regard to railroads operated by steam. Let them pay for every piece of public property its full value to the last cent. To exact less is to rob "the forgotten millions." North street, public property, is occupied by a railroad. How much annual compensation does the city receive therefor? It ought to be worth many thousands of dollars a year to use a street in a great city. If it were my property I should demand for it what it was worth. Why should the city do less? Or is it not time to stop taking away the property of the many and giving it to the few?

Gas supply and electric lights are of the same nature, save that the city ought to make provision as soon as possible to acquire works of its own. Yet we hear a good deal of foolish talk about competition in electric lighting still. Experience will teach us better. But why wait until we have paid the dear tuition which experience charges before we act? The correct method in such cases is simple enough. Existing companies should be bought out if they will sell at a reasonable price; otherwise they should be brought to terms by a vigorous municipal competition. No legal monopoly should ever be granted a private corporation, for that is worth a great deal of money. As a legal monopoly can only be conferred by public authority, the public ought to derive the advantage therefrom, and what this advantage is previous powers have shown. I will again only remind the readers of the *Sun* that the city of Leeds has told me that the people of that city are well supplied for forty-four cents a thousand.

**The Union Labor Party and the Cooper Union Party.**

INDIANAPOLIS, March 8.—The national committee of the union labor party, at its session in this city on March 6, selected Cincinnati as the place and May 15 as the time for holding a national convention. A feature of the meeting was the presentation, by L. F. Zane of Bradford, Pa., of a letter from Dr. Edward McGlynn. The substance of Dr. McGlynn's letter was a proposal that the union labor and united labor parties should unite on a platform which should advocate the tax on land values, and otherwise be the same as that adopted at Cincinnati. The letter urged that all should be willing to sink minor differences of opinion for the sake of the adoption of a few fundamental and essential principles, and that Dr. McGlynn and his friends were, therefore, anxious to do something to effect a union between those whose belief in material issues was substantially the same. "The land clause in our platform" (the *Sun* case), said the letter, "is a vital one to the party in this state. We believe devotedly in it and any reduction of its demands would simply leave us without a following." He thought that the union labor party could accept this part of the platform consistently and advised that a joint call be issued by both branches for a joint national convention. Dr. McGlynn's letter was listened to respectfully, but there was no disposition manifested to accept any of the suggestions made, and the committee voted to refer it to Thomas Gruelle, with instructions to answer it by saying that the union labor party could not accede to the terms proposed, but that if Dr. McGlynn's party would send delegates to the Cincinnati convention they would be received, and with them a basis of consolidation might be made. The committee then adjourned to meet in Cincinnati May 11. Colonel S. F. Norton, editor of the *Chicago Sentinel*; Jesse Harper of Danville, Ill.; Hon. A. J. Streeter of Illinois; and E. P. Altis of Michigan, persistently and systematically are going to have a tremendous advantage over its



ANTI-POVERTY.

THE SOCIETY AND THE COOKING PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.

Dr. McGlynn Discovers the Meaning of the Syracuse Platform—A Personal Explanation.

The announced subject of Dr. McGlynn's address before the anti-poverty society on Sunday evening last, was, "The Anti-Poverty Society and the Presidential Campaign;" and the rumor that the speaker would do some plain talking attracted an audience which, in spite of the rain, filled about three-quarters of the seating capacity of the Academy of Music. Dr. Sylvester L. Malone of Brooklyn occupied the chair.

Dr. McGlynn began by announcing that on the previous day there had occurred an event that would become historic—the issuance of a call for a national conference, which should resolve itself into a national convention, and so give direction to a great national party. He stated that the conference would nominate candidates for the highest offices within the gift of the people; and while of course the most sanguine could not hope to see those candidates elected, the canvass would at all events give world wide advertisement to the principles of the united labor party.

Dr. McGlynn characterized as ridiculous any assertion that the Syracuse platform had no other object than mere state issues. It was only necessary to read the platform to see that in almost every line it proclaimed itself a national platform. He denounced the idea that it should be held a matter of more concern how people think than how they vote. He compared the change of front of those who thought it would be good policy to support the party that should take the free trade side of the tariff issue to the miraculous conversion of Saul of Tarsus when he was converted into Paul the apostle; and thought the united labor party should never forget the object with which it started out, or belittle the mandate given to call a conference for the formation of a great national party. The trouble with these men was that they lacked what pugilists call staying power. He considered it more important how men voted than how they thought. Thinking men would always be comparatively few. The great bulk of mankind must take their politics largely on faith. The speaker quoted from THE STANDARD to support the proposition that protectionists and free traders should unite in support of the single tax on land values.

Dr. McGlynn then went on to refer to certain occurrences connected with the anti-poverty society.

[When the statements of the withdrawing members of the committee as to these occurrences were published in THE STANDARD, Dr. McGlynn was offered the use of its columns for any statement he might wish to make. As he declined the offer, his version of the occurrences has not been given to our readers. We, therefore, give the stenographer's report of this part of his address.]

Dr. McGlynn said:

At the Pythagoras hall meeting I said some of the writers of THE STANDARD, including Mr. Henry George himself, are practically trying to side-track into the democratic party, but I for one protest that we shall not become a tail for the democratic kite, and I said that I have seen in one of the morning papers the statement that Mr. Henry George says he will not be our candidate. The worst words that I have ever said in this unpleasant controversy were then said by me. I then said: "Well, the fact is we do not want Mr. Henry George for our candidate any longer." I also said Mr. Henry George has already disqualified himself as a possible candidate for our nomination by what he has been putting in the columns of his paper for the last two months. We can find good men to nominate. That is the worst word that I said. The next worst thing, perhaps, that I have said in the whole controversy was this. I said: "If it should appear that after all there is not going to be so much free trade as some of these friends of ours would like and seem to expect in the democratic platform, and it will turn out that there should not be scarcely any issue at all—if when we shall have held our conference Mr. Henry George shall choose to come back and support it he will have to take a less important position in the ranks than he previously held."

It was high time that I, at Pythagoras hall, that John MacKinnon, at the county committee meeting, and Mr. Garbert Barnes in Brooklyn, should have called attention publicly and emphatically to what was going on; that our party was being undermined, supported ourselves into such a condition that a large part of our friends throughout the state and country who were looking to New York for guidance and encouragement were amazed and knew not what to think. The correspondence of THE STANDARD in overwhelming majority were expressing dissatisfaction with the editorial policy, and we have private information that not a few had their communications suppressed.

And now comes something touching the anti-poverty society immediately. Beginning in the newspapers, through the indiscretion of people who could not keep their own counsel, it was said that something was going to happen at the next meeting of the anti-poverty society to its reverend president, and that they who were to do that work had a majority of the executive committee with them. The president of the society thought that it was his duty to prevent anything happening to the best interests of the society. The very gentlemen who are now protesting had urged upon him the formation of this society. Mr. Henry George had sent for him, and begged him to come to his office, and said Mr. So-and-so, mentioning an employee of his office, wants you to establish an anti-poverty society, and we want you to establish it. And I said: "Well, yes; it is a good thing. I will think it over." And these gentlemen were impatient; irritated at my deliberation; at my wishing to postpone; at the difficulties proposed by me and some of my best friends. And there was great impatience that I actually would not rush out and hold the public meeting long before we did hold our first public meeting on the 1st of May in Chickering hall. These very men who are now protesting urged upon me the formation of an anti-poverty society. They said, "We want a platform for you. We want you to be a speaker on that platform." They told me substantially, "We want it to be your pulp," and I believe that they were kind enough to think that I had a certain number of friends in this city who would help to fill the hall when I appeared. We formed a society and they elected officers. They elected me president. They elected Mr. George vice-president and elected other officers. They and the president had a consultation. They forced upon me the power of electing the executive committee. The president appointed the committee; appointed several of the employees of THE STANDARD and their friends to a great extent; and he almost befriended his own friends by appointing none of

them on that committee out of certain feelings of delicacy—his own oldest friends in St. Stephens parish who had remained so faithful. At a meeting in August last the very gentlemen who have since been protesting were present in large numbers at the meeting of the executive committee, and they adopted unanimously a resolution empowering the president of the society to drop members named from the executive committee. They forced the appointing power upon me and the dismissing power upon me. On the Monday evening there came a solid phalanx, as it were, of eleven men to the rooms of the anti-poverty society with the apparently antedetermined purpose of deposing me from the presidency of that society. An inkling of their intentions had got into the newspapers. It would seem that they had sent around what in parliamentary language is called a "whip" to drum up any men that they could by persuasion, by representation, and some of them, I am afraid, by a little misrepresentation, a distortion of facts, to come to that meeting to humiliate, to, if necessary, depose, suspend the president. The president is conscious that he has a fair share of the old Adam left in him still. And the president thought it would be rather a pity for the society to be broken up, to allow a hostile faction to come in and occupy this stage the next Sunday evening while allowing him the privilege of paying for a seat. The president thought he had better exercise his constitutional power and appoint a few new members, and he was able fortunately to fall back upon the advice given him by these very gentlemen, namely, to appoint a few of his friends, the parishioners of St. Stephens. And so he did appoint some of them, and two of the Malone family of Brooklyn. When this solid phalanx came into the anti-poverty room some of them, I am told, became almost as nervous as a shot at seeing certain strangers in the room. "Who are these strangers?" Oh, they are members of the committee who have been recently appointed by the president. Among the gentlemen who marched in as if in solid phalanx (there were eleven of them altogether who dropped in with preternatural punctuality before the time) was one who had never crossed the threshold of that room; many had been away months; some had been there only three or four times. They all came by preconcerted arrangement for the one purpose that they immediately avowed. With a smile that was as nearly childlike and bland as could make it, before the meeting was called to order I said: "Gentlemen, I have appointed some new members of the committee. I wrote a letter to the parishioners of St. Stephens the other day begging them to discontinue their meetings, and have appointed some of them to this committee and also two of the Malone family of Brooklyn, who have been such excellent members of this society and rendered such valuable aid to it." It was pretty clear to my mind that these gentlemen, who had come in so solid a phalanx, had come there for the purpose of exacting humiliating apologies from me for the humiliation which they thought I had tried to put on Mr. George; and when they found these strangers there they were somewhat disconcerted. There was not much time for consultation, and one of them, the late treasurer of the society, jumped up and immediately proposed that the minutes be dispensed with, so eager were they to come to the important business of humiliating the president. Our good friends made dilatory motions till enough of our friends could arrive to give us the majority. And they insisted upon the reading of the minutes, and that it be put to a vote whether the minutes be dispensed with or not. In the meanwhile, by ones and twos, the new members kept dropping in, and the phalanx felt that if they were going to do anything their time was getting rather short. And by main strength the minutes were dispensed with. Then Mr. Shriver said: "I move that for grave cause the president be suspended from his office." Well, some of our friends felt that they had not quite a majority yet. Our friends were a little slow in coming to time that night, but we forgave them for it. They came after a while in good time, it turned out. When the motion was made to suspend the president, a point of order was taken to the effect that the whole business was out of order; that it was certainly out of order to move to suspend the president from his office for grave cause, when the very reason that they gave was the simple exercise of his constitutional right in appointing members of the committee. Well, that point of order was wrangled over for some time, and speeches were made showing that Dr. McGlynn had humiliated Mr. George. I said, no; and I explained what I had said. The point of order was put to a vote. By this time we had a clear majority. There was a show of hands on the affirmative side, but before the show of hands on the negative side, which would have been a majority against the suspension, was made there was a call for the roll, and when the names of the newly added members began to be called the factious members began to get restless. They were not lawfully appointed members. And when we were wrangling over that one of the faction moved an adjournment. It was seconded by another, and the factious chairman of the executive committee declared the motion carried (although it was overwhelmingly defeated by the votes) and said it was carried by the majority of the bona fide members. Whereupon, they applauded, some of them. And the chairman was guilty of the grossest, brutal, insulting disrespect to the president. When some of the new members came in he asked, "Who is that?" I said, "Oh, it is one of our new members, Mr. So-and-so; allow me to introduce him to you, gentlemen."

"I didn't ask you, sir," he said. "Oh," said I, "I thought you wanted the information. So I have given it to you."

Then these gentlemen went out into the hall, and we learned from the truthful newspapers next morning that some of them began to curse and swear, and that some of them denounced the president as a damned scoundrel, and as because the president had shown that while he can talk about the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and try to impress your hearts with the proper love for the brotherhood, that he was not quite so foolish as he looks sometimes, and was able to assert his constitutional rights for the best interests and protection and salvation of the society from utter ruin and disruption. The selfsame gentleman, I am told, in talking to some newspaper man, talked about the dual character of the president, comparing him to a certain stage character. You have heard of recently, Mr. Hyde and Dr. Jekyll. Some little show of turning on the part of the president on that occasion won for him that very flattering picture from the late chairman of the executive committee. Then the very same week every blessed man of them nearly went into the columns of THE STANDARD newspaper, and they were for all the world—every one of them over twenty-one years of age—were for all the world like a lot of gossiping little girls, or worse, like a lot of old women, old crones. They went, as if to the wash tub of THE STANDARD office, and they then brought in their piece of dirty linen and insisted upon washing it before the whole public, or at least that portion of it, not very large, which sees the columns of THE STANDARD. "Did you hear

that Dr. McGlynn said so-and-so on one occasion? That Mr. MacKinnon said so-and-so? Garbert Barnes said so-and-so to me and I said so-and-so to him? Did you?"

And what does it all amount to? They worked themselves up into the conviction—no, but they made believe that they did—that we had been humiliating Mr. George and had been imputing personal motives. But they were altogether wrong. They paid me the very poor compliment of thinking that I am a sort of fat baby that always has to be led by the nose by somebody, and the only question is, who has him by the nose now? Now, I say, let them settle up between themselves how to reconcile this unfortunate baby being led by the nose on the one hand and that jaw of a prize fighter on the other. What does it all mean? Simply that we have said that we would go ahead to do what we started out to do and are not going to be side-tracked by Mr. George or the other writers of THE STANDARD. That is all, and those gentlemen, failing in their nefarious attempt to rule or ruin the anti-poverty society, began to curse and swear, and they misrepresented. They told half truths and whole falsehoods. They put things in a false light in the columns of the papers, and they lied in THE STANDARD—utterly false. One thing that above all things it is proper to correct is that statement made by Mr. McCready that I had refused to appoint certain ladies as members of the executive committee, as they would "shoot off their mouths." Now, I think I can almost safely swear that I never used that phrase in all my life, and that, in fact, I would not know what it means except by guessing from the context that they speak too much or too readily, or something like that. And Mr. Urner, a venerable gentleman, said that he did not mean to charge Dr. McGlynn with pecuniary dishonesty—let us be thankful—but that Dr. McGlynn was very unbusinesslike, and had made some trouble about some dollars that had been sent, and had put Mr. Urner to the trouble of writing several letters; but he did not mean to cast any imputation on my personal honesty. Well, that was a little trying to that old Adam that is still buried away in me here that I should be indebted to the magnanimity of this venerable old Mr. Urner.

That kind of thing provoked from me at a meeting of the west side branch that was being organized by Mr. Shriver the saying that these people had forced upon me the responsibility for this society, and made me president. And some of my friends were good enough to say that without that executive committee the society could not have gotten on. I said: "Gentlemen, I have appointed some new members of the committee. I wrote a letter to the parishioners of St. Stephens the other day begging them to discontinue their meetings, and have appointed some of them to this committee and also two of the Malone family of Brooklyn, who have been such excellent members of this society and rendered such valuable aid to it." It was pretty clear to my mind that these gentlemen, who had come in so solid a phalanx, had come there for the purpose of exacting humiliating apologies from me for the humiliation which they thought I had tried to put on Mr. George; and when they found these strangers there they were somewhat disconcerted. There was not much time for consultation, and one of them, the late treasurer of the society, jumped up and immediately proposed that the minutes be dispensed with, so eager were they to come to the important business of humiliating the president. Our good friends made dilatory motions till enough of our friends could arrive to give us the majority. And they insisted upon the reading of the minutes, and that it be put to a vote whether the minutes be dispensed with or not. In the meanwhile, by ones and twos, the new members kept dropping in, and the phalanx felt that if they were going to do anything their time was getting rather short. And by main strength the minutes were dispensed with. Then Mr. Shriver said: "I move that for grave cause the president be suspended from his office." Well, some of our friends felt that they had not quite a majority yet. Our friends were a little slow in coming to time that night, but we forgave them for it. They came after a while in good time, it turned out. When the motion was made to suspend the president, a point of order was taken to the effect that the whole business was out of order; that it was certainly out of order to move to suspend the president from his office for grave cause, when the very reason that they gave was the simple exercise of his constitutional right in appointing members of the committee. Well, that point of order was wrangled over for some time, and speeches were made showing that Dr. McGlynn had humiliated Mr. George. I said, no; and I explained what I had said. The point of order was put to a vote. By this time we had a clear majority. There was a show of hands on the affirmative side, but before the show of hands on the negative side, which would have been a majority against the suspension, was made there was a call for the roll, and when the names of the newly added members began to be called the factious members began to get restless. They were not lawfully appointed members. And when we were wrangling over that one of the faction moved an adjournment. It was seconded by another, and the factious chairman of the executive committee declared the motion carried (although it was overwhelmingly defeated by the votes) and said it was carried by the majority of the bona fide members. Whereupon, they applauded, some of them. And the chairman was guilty of the grossest, brutal, insulting disrespect to the president. When some of the new members came in he asked, "Who is that?" I said, "Oh, it is one of our new members, Mr. So-and-so; allow me to introduce him to you, gentlemen."

"I didn't ask you, sir," he said. "Oh," said I, "I thought you wanted the information. So I have given it to you."

Then these gentlemen went out into the hall, and we learned from the truthful newspapers next morning that some of them began to curse and swear, and that some of them denounced the president as a damned scoundrel, and as because the president had shown that while he can talk about the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and try to impress your hearts with the proper love for the brotherhood, that he was not quite so foolish as he looks sometimes, and was able to assert his constitutional rights for the best interests and protection and salvation of the society from utter ruin and disruption. The selfsame gentleman, I am told, in talking to some newspaper man, talked about the dual character of the president, comparing him to a certain stage character. You have heard of recently, Mr. Hyde and Dr. Jekyll. Some little show of turning on the part of the president on that occasion won for him that very flattering picture from the late chairman of the executive committee. Then the very same week every blessed man of them nearly went into the columns of THE STANDARD newspaper, and they were for all the world—every one of them over twenty-one years of age—were for all the world like a lot of gossiping little girls, or worse, like a lot of old women, old crones. They went, as if to the wash tub of THE STANDARD office, and they then brought in their piece of dirty linen and insisted upon washing it before the whole public, or at least that portion of it, not very large, which sees the columns of THE STANDARD. "Did you hear

that Dr. McGlynn said so-and-so on one occasion? That Mr. MacKinnon said so-and-so? Garbert Barnes said so-and-so to me and I said so-and-so to him? Did you?"

And what does it all amount to? They worked themselves up into the conviction—no, but they made believe that they did—that we had been humiliating Mr. George and had been imputing personal motives. But they were altogether wrong. They paid me the very poor compliment of thinking that I am a sort of fat baby that always has to be led by the nose by somebody, and the only question is, who has him by the nose now? Now, I say, let them settle up between themselves how to reconcile this unfortunate baby being led by the nose on the one hand and that jaw of a prize fighter on the other. What does it all mean? Simply that we have said that we would go ahead to do what we started out to do and are not going to be side-tracked by Mr. George or the other writers of THE STANDARD. That is all, and those gentlemen, failing in their nefarious attempt to rule or ruin the anti-poverty society, began to curse and swear, and they misrepresented. They told half truths and whole falsehoods. They put things in a false light in the columns of the papers, and they lied in THE STANDARD—utterly false. One thing that above all things it is proper to correct is that statement made by Mr. McCready that I had refused to appoint certain ladies as members of the executive committee, as they would "shoot off their mouths." Now, I think I can almost safely swear that I never used that phrase in all my life, and that, in fact, I would not know what it means except by guessing from the context that they speak too much or too readily, or something like that. And Mr. Urner, a venerable gentleman, said that he did not mean to charge Dr. McGlynn with pecuniary dishonesty—let us be thankful—but that Dr. McGlynn was very unbusinesslike, and had made some trouble about some dollars that had been sent, and had put Mr. Urner to the trouble of writing several letters; but he did not mean to cast any imputation on my personal honesty. Well, that was a little trying to that old Adam that is still buried away in me here that I should be indebted to the magnanimity of this venerable old Mr. Urner.

That kind of thing provoked from me at a meeting of the west side branch that was being organized by Mr. Shriver the saying that these people had forced upon me the responsibility for this society, and made me president. And some of my friends were good enough to say that without that executive committee the society could not have gotten on. I said: "Gentlemen, I have appointed some new members of the committee. I wrote a letter to the parishioners of St. Stephens the other day begging them to discontinue their meetings, and have appointed some of them to this committee and also two of the Malone family of Brooklyn, who have been such excellent members of this society and rendered such valuable aid to it." It was pretty clear to my mind that these gentlemen, who had come in so solid a phalanx, had come there for the purpose of exacting humiliating apologies from me for the humiliation which they thought I had tried to put on Mr. George; and when they found these strangers there they were somewhat disconcerted. There was not much time for consultation, and one of them, the late treasurer of the society, jumped up and immediately proposed that the minutes be dispensed with, so eager were they to come to the important business of humiliating the president. Our good friends made dilatory motions till enough of our friends could arrive to give us the majority. And they insisted upon the reading of the minutes, and that it be put to a vote whether the minutes be dispensed with or not. In the meanwhile, by ones and twos, the new members kept dropping in, and the phalanx felt that if they were going to do anything their time was getting rather short. And by main strength the minutes were dispensed with. Then Mr. Shriver said: "I move that for grave cause the president be suspended from his office." Well, some of our friends felt that they had not quite a majority yet. Our friends were a little slow in coming to time that night, but we forgave them for it. They came after a while in good time, it turned out. When the motion was made to suspend the president, a point of order was taken to the effect that the whole business was out of order; that it was certainly out of order to move to suspend the president from his office for grave cause, when the very reason that they gave was the simple exercise of his constitutional right in appointing members of the committee. Well, that point of order was wrangled over for some time, and speeches were made showing that Dr. McGlynn had humiliated Mr. George. I said, no; and I explained what I had said. The point of order was put to a vote. By this time we had a clear majority. There was a show of hands on the affirmative side, but before the show of hands on the negative side, which would have been a majority against the suspension, was made there was a call for the roll, and when the names of the newly added members began to be called the factious members began to get restless. They were not lawfully appointed members. And when we were wrangling over that one of the faction moved an adjournment. It was seconded by another, and the factious chairman of the executive committee declared the motion carried (although it was overwhelmingly defeated by the votes) and said it was carried by the majority of the bona fide members. Whereupon, they applauded, some of them. And the chairman was guilty of the grossest, brutal, insulting disrespect to the president. When some of the new members came in he asked, "Who is that?" I said, "Oh, it is one of our new members, Mr. So-and-so; allow me to introduce him to you, gentlemen."

A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.—Dear —: Yours of March 1 duly received. It seems to me that you entirely fail to comprehend the system advocated by Henry George when you say that the overthrow of a custom (private property in land) "would bring distress upon not individuals alone but all classes who bear any responsibility in life." Now it seems to me that if this means anything it means that all would be distressed and none benefited beyond a few perhaps who are idle and shiftless. According to your view the shifting of taxes from the products of industry would entail universal distress! How the idle and shiftless would be benefited by such a condition passes understanding, since their only source of relief must be in the general prosperity of the people.

You say "the George plan advocates force," and that "his arguments insidiously pamper the revolutionary spirit of man." True, all reform implies revolution and all action involves force, but you seem to object to these agents as applied to this particular reform, and virtually charge him with dishonesty when you use such terms. I do not understand him to advocate force in any obnoxious sense. He simply proposes to change or modify a force already in existence; to remove all burdens in the shape of taxation upon the products of industry and pay them upon the products of land and value. Whence lies the wrong? How will such a change produce the "universal distress" which you deplore? On the contrary, it seems to me that such a change would give a wonderful impetus to industry; that enforced idleness would disappear; that all who are willing to work would have the opportunity, of which hundreds of thousands in this country are to-day deprived. Very likely a certain percentage would remain confirmed tramps, but under a system of taxation that encouraged industry, that percentage would necessarily diminish. It could not possibly be otherwise.

It has been a practice by some towns to remove the position of the whole of taxation to manufacturing enterprises established within their precincts. Without such abatement of taxes no factory would have been built, and the opportunity for the employment of hundreds of workers would have been lost. Is there any reason why a success like this would not be duplicated upon a larger scale? I have a piece of land near this city upon which I contemplate building for a permanent home. Yet I hesitate. Why so? Because now it is taxed only \$9 a year, and if I build upon it the taxes will immediately rise to at least \$40 per year. So I guess I'll wait a while and keep the money that the buildings will cost at interest, and pay only the \$9 tax. But suppose the tax is shifted from all products of industry to land values, and my land is taxed even as high as \$40 (an extreme limit—probably it would not be more than \$25 or \$30), how quick buildings would blossom upon that land! With or without buildings the tax would not be increased, except as the rental value of the land increased. I might put a hundred thousand dollars worth of buildings upon the land, and still my tax would remain the same. Every owner of valuable land being affected in the same manner, you will at once perceive what an immense boon would be given to human industry. "Universal distress" would become unknown. Speculation in land would absolutely cease. European and other capitalists and syndicates, who have grabbed immense areas of unoccupied land, would be obliged to abandon their unused holdings to those who would improve. Wild, unproductive land, beyond the limits of present settlement, has now no taxable value, consequently it is not taxed. No one would go upon such land until they wished to use it, and it would have no rental value until the influx of new settlers created such values. Rental value having thus been created, how eminently just and equitable, from every point of view, is it that such rental value should be absorbed in taxation for the common good so far as might be beneficial. This is the single tax system in a nutshell, and it is important in examining this question that we keep this central principle constantly in mind. All else is a matter of detail.

All human laws are based in theory upon the equality of man—not that all men are equal in capacity, but that each and all have a natural right to equal opportunity. Any system which tends to impair or subvert this natural right is manifestly inequitable, and therefore contrary to the spirit of human law. You argue that it is wrong to absorb land values without compensation. But why wrong? If the land monopolists, who have so long fattened upon the industry of the people while they themselves have remained idle, adding nothing to the world's stock of wealth by their own labor, have rendered no equitable return for their land share, why should they be compensated for the loss of power for further extortion? These land values have been created by the industry of the whole people—why add to ill-gotten gains? It would seem to be more in the line of equity and justice to compel the land monopolist to restore to the people the wealth so wrongfully taken. The land of Manhattan island was originally purchased by a Dutchman for the sum of twenty-four dollars. To-day its value is at least one thousand million dollars. Would there be any justice in paying the whole or any portion of this value to the descendants or devisees of the Dutchman, by way of compensation, when we consider that this enormous increase in value is due to the industry of the whole people of the city of New York? Nay, not of New York alone, but of the whole country and of the whole world.

But the land value tax system advocated by Henry George does not propose restitution; it simply asks that wrongful extortion should cease. Man is a creature of progress. The ever onward march of civilization unfolds to him new duties and new possibilities. As he emerges from the darkness of mediæval serfdom, the distinction between right and wrong becomes clearer and more accurately defined. In our own country, founded on the principles of perfect equality before the law, he finds certain privileges obtaining, insignificant at first, but waxing stronger, and which threaten at no distant day to subvert and destroy that principle. He sees combined wealth—wealth in a large measure derived from land monopoly, the railroad and the telegraph—crystallizing into syndicates and trusts, monster corporations like the Standard Oil, whose action tends solely to one evil, that of crushing out all opposition. Like the octopus, they crush and absorb everything within their reach. Their agents and tools invade our legislative halls and corrupt our courts of justice. The recent failure in New York to indict two noted millionaires for fraudulent conversion of three millions in bonds—a failure not attributable to improbability of guilt, but to the potent power of a well filled purse—may well cause us to pause and ask, "What are we coming to?" Against the irresistible power of these gigantic combinations, the individual concern with a capital of a few thousands, or even a few hundred thousand, fares no better than the humblest tradesman.

Already the skies are brightening, societies for the discussion of the single tax system are being formed all over the country. They have regular meetings, where the subject receives full and free discussion and all possible objections are met and answered. Mayor Hewitt of New York has recently put himself upon record in advocacy of one of the principal features of the single tax system by recommending the abolition of all taxes upon personal property and confining them entirely to real estate, claiming that such a change would greatly benefit the business interests of the city. He also favors the acquirement by the city of certain wharf lands now held as private property. Further, he favors the building of a rapid transit subway railroad by the city. He thus fights about one-half of Henry George's battle. At this rate he will fight the whole of it shortly. Once embarked in the right course there is no stopping place short of that goal toward which eternal justice points. Truly the world moves! The advocates of the single tax need no necessity for inflicting hardship upon any legitimate interest. The proposed change might be gradual, say at the rate of five per cent per annum, completing the change in twenty years. It is confidently believed, however, that the excellence of the change would be so rapidly demonstrated as to insure its complete fruition at a much earlier period. H. H. BOARDMAN.

for the discussion of the single tax system are being formed all over the country. They have regular meetings, where the subject receives full and free discussion and all possible objections are met and answered. Mayor Hewitt of New York has recently put himself upon record in advocacy of one of the principal features of the single tax system by recommending the abolition of all taxes upon personal property and confining them entirely to real estate, claiming that such a change would greatly benefit the business interests of the city. He also favors the acquirement by the city of certain wharf lands now held as private property. Further, he favors the building of a rapid transit subway railroad by the city. He thus fights about one-half of Henry George's battle. At this rate he will fight the whole of it shortly. Once embarked in the right course there is no stopping place short of that goal toward which eternal justice points. Truly the world moves! The advocates of the single tax need no necessity for inflicting hardship upon any legitimate interest. The proposed change might be gradual, say at the rate of five per cent per annum, completing the change in twenty years. It is confidently believed, however, that the excellence of the change would be so rapidly demonstrated as to insure its complete fruition at a much earlier period. H. H. BOARDMAN.

LESSONS FROM THE BLIZZARD.

The terrific storm that swept over this whole region of country this week caused enormous damage and inconvenience wherever it raged, but nowhere were its effects so marvellous as in the city of New York. The business and social life of a vast metropolis was paralyzed at a single blow. Exchanges, banks and private firms ceased to transact business. The administration of justice was practically suspended in the courts. The stock of fuel and provisions in the smaller groceries was speedily exhausted, and for days could not be replenished, so that people were actually subjected to famine in the very center of civilization within apparently easy reach of abundance. Men who had the courage to attempt a journey on Monday from their homes to their places of business actually became lost in snow drifts in the city of New York and perished of cold. Men residing but a few miles from the city were unable for more than two days to reach the city. Many streets were impassable for vehicles, and there were well grounded apprehensions of an awful conflagration in case any fire broke out. Theaters closed and social intercourse ceased. Never before was there given such conclusive evidence of the vital importance of the transportation problem to the people of a great city.

It was the lack of proper facilities for transportation that rendered it possible for even so great a storm to thus paralyze human activity. Travel on the surface street railways has been suspended before, and the streets have previously been badly blocked with snow, but never before has the operation of all the elevated roads been stopped. It was this that rendered it impossible for people to reach their places of business at the time when all other methods of transit were greatly impaired. This could not have occurred with underground roads, nor could the situation have been so prolonged with elevated roads built on properly constructed viaducts and faithfully managed in the interests of the public. Public attention has recently been directed to the provision of adequate means for rapid transit by the municipality. The loss and inconvenience to which our people have been subjected this week through the lack of such provision not only shows the necessity for prompt action, but demonstrates that the matter of transit is so vital to our very existence as a great metropolis that we cannot safely leave it in private hands.

Evidence has also been given by this storm that our municipal government is poorly equipped for meeting great emergencies, even in the performance of those public duties that it does assume. It would have been unreasonable to expect that it could deal as promptly with the altogether phenomenal task imposed upon it by this terrific blizzard as it deals with that imposed by an ordinary snow storm, and hence there is some cause for the failure of the street cleaning department to do anything at all on Monday, but by Tuesday evening private enterprise had cleared the sidewalks. The principal streets, while apparently nothing at all had been done by the public authorities, and little if anything by the corporations to which the use of the public streets has been improperly granted.

There is no excuse for this apathy, as there was plenty of labor available for the work, and the safety as well as the comfort of the people depended on its prompt performance. Private firms have actually offered to assist the city in removing snow, and a suggestion that others should do so has received an official endorsement from Commissioner Coleman that reads very much like an appeal to public charity for help in the performance of a duty clearly devolving on the municipality. This is simply one of those breakdowns that occur from time to time in our governmental and social system because the community fails to appropriate the vast land values created by the growth of population, the possession of which alone would justify men in expecting their government to fully perform all of the duties properly devolving on it.

A singular recognition of this impotency of our governmental authorities is emphasized just now by the death of Henry Bergh, president and founder of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Many tributes to Mr. Bergh appear in the daily papers, and the feeling appears to be general that his death is little short of a calamity to the animals of the city. The reason for this singular feeling is found in the fact that Mr. Bergh was the moving spirit of a private association endowed by statute with police powers of its own and given a certain command over the public police force, with a view to preventing the brutal treatment of dumb animals. Now if the prevention of cruelty to animals is a legitimate function of government, the ordinary public agencies ought to be prepared to perform this duty, and if not adequate to its performance, they should be made adequate without an appeal to any private organization to assist in the performance of police duty. The same may be said of the societies for the prevention of vice, for the prevention of cruelty to children, and of all other voluntary associations endowed with police power; and it is equally true of all private associations empowered to assume the custody and control of paupers, lunatics, homeless or incorrigible children, drunkards and others supposed to be incapable of self control. Those who have seen but partly the meaning of the demand that commonly created values shall be taken for common use, and administered by public authority for public purposes, have raised an outcry against the undue enlargement of the power of the state involved in such a scheme. Such people have utterly failed to comprehend the extent to which the state has depended on voluntary

and really charitable assistance for the performance of its obvious duties, while it has meanwhile been using its powers to regulate or benefit numerous private businesses that can be much better managed without its interference. The advocates of the land movement are the only people who clearly see the well defined line that separates public functions from private duties, and at this stage of the discussion they cannot do better than utilize every opportunity to point out the failure of governments to perform their rightful duties through lack of means, and on the other hand show the evil results of taxing the products of industry.

Another lesson is easily deduced from the results of the storm. We have experienced in New York and in all this region of country the distressing result of a sudden and complete paralysis of all railway transportation and telegraphic communication. A proposition to voluntarily bring about an equally complete cessation of railway travel and transportation throughout the whole country has recently been seriously considered by the Brotherhood of locomotive engineers, a means to enforcing their demands on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy railroad company.

The engineers have indicated that they will adopt such a policy in a certain contingency. The Chicago, Burlington and Quincy officers have just as clearly indicated their entire willingness to see all railway travel thus suspended rather than grant what disinterested persons who had studied the question regard as the legitimate and reasonable demands of the engineers. Without entering at all into this controversy between two opposing organizations of private individuals over a matter of purely pecuniary concern to them as engineers and stockholders, it is not plain to all that the control of the great highways of commerce ought not to be in the hands of private individuals who may, because of a personal dispute, bring about in the country at large as complete a paralysis of transportation as that wrought by the terrible storm of this week in New York and its vicinity? Such a calamity thus brought about would not only be more exasperating than that to which this city has just been subjected, but actually more injurious. In case of an earthquake or hurricane there is a general acceptance of the inevitable consequences, and men adapted themselves to the situation, but a complete stoppage of transportation and travel, when people are prepared and expecting to do business, would aggravate the resulting evils. Thus the blizzard comes to aid the tariff agitation in forcing upon public attention the great economic problems that urgently demand solution in the near future. Wm. T. CROSDALE.

The New York Call for a Conference.

28 COOPER UNION, New York, March 10, 1888.

The following resolution was adopted by the Syracuse convention of the united labor party in August last:

Resolved, That, in view of the near approach of the national contest, this convention joins with our brethren of the west in requesting the chairmen of our state committees to co-operate with the land and labor committee in issuing a call for a national conference of such organizations of citizens of other states as may be disposed to act with the united labor party of New York in forming a great national party.

In pursuance of this resolution the undersigned hereby call upon all electors of the United States who seek the emancipation of labor and the abolition of involuntary poverty by doing away with the system which compels men to pay their fellow creatures for the use of the common bounties of nature and permits monopolizers to deprive labor of natural opportunities for employment, and who believe (1) that by the taxation of land, exclusive of improvements, according to its value and not according to its area, those values which arise not from the exertion of the individual, but from the growth of society, should be devoted to common use and benefit, and that all taxes on industry or its products should be abolished; (2) that the general government should issue all money without the intervention of banks; (3) that all agencies which, like the railroad and the telegraph, are in their nature monopolies should be owned and controlled by the people—to send delegates, three from each congressional district, three from each territory and three from the District of Columbia, to a national conference to be held in Cincinnati on the 15th day of May next, at noon, to aid in forming a great national party, in view of the near approach of the national contest. This committee requests that delegates be empowered by their constituencies to resolve the conference into a convention.

In the language of the call for the Syracuse convention, "We denounce the Democratic and Republican parties as hopelessly and shamelessly corrupt," and by reason of their affiliation with monopolies equally unworthy of the suffrages of those who do not live upon public plunder," and in the words of the platform adopted by that convention, "We ask the co-operation of citizens of other states," and invite them "to ignore all minor differences and join with us in organizing a great national party."

JOHN MACKINNON,  
EDWARD MCGLYNN,  
JAMES REDPATE,  
Land and Labor Committee.  
JOHN H. BLAKENY,  
Chairman State Committee United Labor Party of New York.  
GABRIEL BARNES, Secretary.

The resolution of the Syracuse convention, adopted August 10, 1887, which is quoted in the call, was preceded by the following preamble:

Whereas, At a conference of members of the united labor party of the states of Ohio and Indiana, held in Cincinnati on the 4th of July last, resolutions were adopted urging the central land and labor committee to issue a call for a national conference.

The Cincinnati resolutions referred to were as follows:

Be it resolved, That we, the representatives of the Henry George Society of Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky, in conference assembled at Cincinnati, deem it expedient and necessary that a national conference or convention be held in October, 1887.

We authorize and request Mr. John MacKinnon of New York to appoint a committee of five, of which he shall be chairman, to issue a call for said convention, fixing the time, place, ratio of representation and details of said convention.

The mover and drafter of these resolutions was Mr. S. W. Williams of Vincennes, Indiana, who has recently issued a circular proposing a call for a national conference on July 4.

A Good Illustration.

BIRMINGHAM, Ala.—The land tax and the tariff tax are like the long arm and the short arm of a lever. When we go to lift the long arm the short arm lowers itself and vice versa. Now our aim is to raise this long arm. We cannot just yet. Somebody comes along who wants to lower the short arm. Should we not assist that somebody, whether he be a Democratic or any other somebody? CHARLES E. REID.



For one dollar the Democrat is supplied for 13 months to any address in the United States or Canada.  
Address 5 New Bridge street, London, E. C.



